

Indo-European Syntactic Rules and Gothic Morphology

Vyacheslav V. Ivanov

The present study attempts to view ancient Germanic syntactic structure as it is reflected in Gothic grammatical (i.e. morphological and partly syntactic) patterns. In order to recover the oldest scheme, one may try to compare these Germanic data to patterns of Indo-European syntactic structure as now reconstructed on the basis of Hittite and other Northern and Southern (Luwian) Anatolian languages, Mycenaean and Homeric Greek, Vedic Sanskrit, and other ancient or archaic Indo-European languages.

Let us summarize briefly some of the chief conclusions arrived at in the field of Indo-European syntax, while at the same time recalling the main stages of this research.

The main result was anticipated more than a century ago by Wackernagel, in his law according to which enclitics are put in the second position after the first stressed word in an Indo-European sentence.¹ On the one hand, this law shows the importance of the second position in the sentence, insofar as many key pronominal words² and grammatical particles are placed there.³ On the other hand, initial position in the sentence becomes relevant as well: for instance, the verb may take this position if it is stressed or marked.

Subsequent research (particularly during the past four decades) has shown that in many ancient Indo-European languages, especially those discovered in our century (such as Mycenaean Greek, Hittite, Palaic, Lydian, Luwian-Lycian, the Old Novgorodian dialect of the birch-bark documents)

¹ Wackernagel 1892/1955; Krisch 1990; cf. also Hale 1987; Dunkel 1990, 1992.

² Some of these were studied by Wackernagel much earlier: Wackernagel 1879.

³ Incidentally, this renders artificial a binary scheme that divides the sentence into two phrases only, i.e. a nominal one and a verbal one; the enclitic group often refers to the sentence as a whole, reproducing its main verb-actant structure, or even has a scope broader than a single sentence — on the last point, cf. the remarks of Watkins, 1997, p. 613.

several enclitics may appear in series so as to form an entire chain. It becomes possible to describe such series in terms of a rank-ordered grammar, assigning each element a numerical code according to its place in the chain.⁴

Several important hypotheses have been based on a comparison between the initial elements of the Hittite sentence that introduce such chains and the deictic pronouns and conjunctions or preverbs found in the other Indo-European dialects. In 1939, Sturtevant noted the resemblance of the Old Hittite introductory conjunctions **šu** and **ta** and the deictic pronouns ***so-** and ***to-**, suggesting that original conglomerates of particles were fused together to give rise to later personal pronouns of the third person, and connecting this to “the tendency of the IE pronoun to stand at the head of its clause and to function as a sentence connective in early Skt., Gk., and Gmc.”⁵ In connection to ***to-**, this idea can be supported by data from other languages such as Slavic, and may be considered to have been proven.⁶ A similar comparison was made simultaneously half a century ago in 1947, by Miles Dillon and Ferdinand Sommer (working independently of each other).⁷ They discovered the genetic identity of the Hittite group consisting of an introductory element like **nu-** and a following enclitic chain of particles (including pronominal words) and corresponding Old Irish complexes consisting of a preverb (or some other element) like **no-** and a following enclitic morph (usually pronominal). This discovery was further discussed at the VIIIth International Congress of Linguists in Oslo in 1957, by both Calvert Watkins and myself. We both developed this

⁴ For descriptions of the Hittite rankings of enclitics, see: Hoffner 1973; Watkins 1997, p. 617; Melchert 1994a; cf. Dunkel 1992, pp. 164-165. A brilliant formal scheme for Old Russian has recently been suggested by Zaliznjak 1986, pp. 155-158; 1993, pp. 280-308; 1995, pp. 167-171. By comparing these formal descriptions one may find interesting correspondences, for instance, the tendency to place pronominal enclitics closer to the end of the group, and the similar positioning of the particle ***-t(e)i** > Hittite **z(a)**, Old Russian **-ti** (but see Watkins, *ib.*, on a difference as compared with Luwian).

⁵ Sturtevant 1942, p. 26, §18a; 1939; 1952; Sturtevant and Hahn 1951.

⁶ On the exact correspondence between Old Hittite and Slavic see: Ivanov 1965, pp. 187-190; Ivanov 1979, p. 75; Gamkrelidze, Ivanov 1995, pp. 313-314.

⁷ Dillon 1947; Sommer 1947, p. 70. Cf. Mc Cone 1979.

model in later works, arriving at the following formula for Indo-European sentence structure:

$$I + E_1 (+ E_2 + \dots + E_n) + \dots + V^f$$

where **I** is an introducing element (such as a conjunction, a preverb or a relational noun that has become a preverb), **E_x** is an enclitic element ($n \leq 6^8$ in Hittite and some other languages), and **V^f** is a finite verbal form.⁹ (It can also be shown that in the emphatic pattern, the position of the verb is inverted and it may therefore become a realization of **I**, with the final position assigned to another grammatical element.) Traces of this structure have been found not only in Hittite (and all the other Northern and Southern Anatolian languages) and Celtic, but also in Vedic, in archaic (i.e. Mycenaean and Homeric) Greek, in Tocharian verbal constructions with pronominal enclitics, in Old Lithuanian reflexive forms and pronominal adjectives, and in Slavic enclitic complexes.¹⁰ Accentological studies have shown that in Indo-European (as also later in Slavic according to Vasiljev-Dolobko's law, and in some cases also in Greek), enclitic elements may have become proclitics as well.¹¹ More specifically, it has been shown that the syntactic connectives ***yo-** and ***k^w(e/o)-i-** play a special role in such enclitic complexes. Among later works on the subject, note in particular Josephson's contributions, demonstrating the functional equivalence of the Hittite enclitic particle **-kan** and the Gothic preverb **ga-**.¹²

⁸ It seems possible to see here an intriguing numerical coincidence with Yngve's model presupposing a syntactic role of the "magical number 7" (± 2), which, according to experimental psychology, determines certain limitations on short-term memory.

⁹ Watkins 1962; 1964; Ivanov 1965, pp. 185-265.

¹⁰ Ivanov 1958; 1959, pp. 33-34; 1965; Gamkrelidze, Ivanov 1995, pp. 313-321.

¹¹ For Greek, see Bally 1945/1997, p. 113-114, §229. The problem of enclitics that are proclitics in Indo-European has been studied recently by Jucquois; corresponding Slavic facts have been discussed in a number of accentological works by Dybo.

¹² Josephson 1972; 1976; 1995; 1997.

The present study constitutes an attempt to understand Proto-Germanic syntax in the light of these new concepts.¹³ The border between syntax and morphology in archaic Germanic verbal structures has not been stable (compare the use of preverbs or preposition-like adverbs in Modern German and Modern English). Thus it becomes possible to deduce probable Proto-Germanic syntactic structures from what has in part become a set of morphological patterns in the Gothic verb. Synchronic rules describing the behavior and function of some Gothic verbal constructions may lead to the reconstruction of diachronic developments of ancient Indo-European syntactic rules. The claim is that these IE syntactic patterns were reproduced in the sequencing of morphs in Proto-Germanic and later in Gothic.

There are two specific problems connected to particular features of the Gothic texts. First, almost all of them are translations from Greek. Since the latter has also preserved various old Indo-European enclitics as well as rules governing their order, there is the possibility of some influence from the Greek original, although in the language of the New Testament the ancient patterns of IE syntax have been transformed under pressure from the hypothetical Aramaic prototype of the text, and also for purely chronological reasons having to do with the development of post-Classical Greek. If some turns of phrase in the Gothic translation reproduce Greek enclitic complexes, one may suppose that Greek played the role of a catalyzing influence (a factor that might explain some differences between Gothic patterns and those of the other ancient Germanic languages). But such patterns are mostly found in strictly syntactic enclitics,¹⁴ whereas the most characteristic Gothic structures are formally divergent from Greek, as they concern verbal (and partly pronominal) morphology.¹⁵ Another question that arises from the translational nature of the texts concerns their bookish character. We know very little about conversational Gothic, only a few such phrases having been discovered. Still, bearing in mind all of the differences

¹³ For some preliminary remarks on Gothic cf. Ivanov 1965, pp. 251-252, fn. 238-239.

¹⁴ Klein's studies have revealed a complicated picture of the relationship between Gothic complexes with **-uh** and corresponding elements in Greek: Klein 1994; Klein, Condon 1993.

¹⁵ This general problem is discussed in connection to prepositional phrases in Klein 1992 (with further literature).

between oral and written forms of language, one may hope that certain features of oral language have been reproduced in some parts of the texts, as for instance in the translations of Jesus' direct speech.¹⁶

A specific phonemic feature is helpful in identifying certain Gothic enclitic complexes purely from the point of view of their sound structure: several types of internal sandhi changes are found mostly at the boundaries of elements belonging to a group of former clitics.

The initial Indo-European chain of enclitic/proclitic particles is reflected in the beginning of such Gothic complexes as: (1) **ga-u-laubjats** "do both of you (2 P. Dual.) believe" = πιστεύετε (Mt. IX.28, in the beginning of an interrogative sentence), cf. **þu ga-u-laubeis du sunau gudis?** "do you (2 P. Sg.) believe in the Son of Man (=God)" = σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, J. IX.35); (2) **ga-u-lva-selvi** "Do you see anything?" = εἶ τι βλέπεις (Mk.VIII.23, an entire sentence consisting of a single Gothic prefixed verbal form corresponding to three Greek words); (3) **ga-þau-laubidedeiþ mis** "you would believe me" = ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί (J. V.46); (4) **ga-þl=(u)hl-þan-miþ-sandidedum** "we are (?) sending along with (him)" = συνεπέμψαμεν δὲ¹⁷ μετ' (2 C. VIII.18); (5) **diz-uh-þan-sat** "seized" = εἶχεν "possessed", Moulton 1978, p. 180 (Mk. XVI.8); (6) **ni-u** [negative plus interrogative particle; in confirmation questions, expects a positive answer — English *isn't it so that*, French *n'est-ce pas*, German *nicht wahr*]¹⁸ (= οὐχ, Mt. VI.26, = οὐκ, J. XI.40, in the beginning of a sentence); **þau ni-u wituþ** "Do you not know" = Ἡ ἀγνοεῖτε, R. VII.1, at the beginning of a new chapter (with the Gothic structured in a completely different way as compared with the Greek original, where the privative preverb is attached to the verbal stem and fused with its root); **þau[h] ni-u kunnuþ** "do you not realize" = ἢ οὐκ ἐπιγνώσκετε, 2 C. XIII.5, at the beginning of a sentence); (7) **ni-(u)h** "and not" = Greek οὐδέ (J. XV.4; Gal.

¹⁶ From this point of view, important findings have emerged from the preliminary study of Gothic discourse in terms of the means of combining sentences and other types of narrative organization, as found in Klein 1994; Klein, Condon 1993.

¹⁷ Klein (1994, p. 255, table 1, III; p. 263, fn. 17; pp. 273-274) has found that a translational relationship between δέ and **-uh þan** is seen in 97 of 123 occurrences of **-uh þan** (= 0.78) in the Gospels.

¹⁸ Lehmann 1986, p. 265, N 18.

II.3) ; (8) **ni-þ[(u)h]-þan + nauh-þan-uh qam Jesus in weihsa** “now Jesus had not yet entered the village”¹⁹ = οὐπω δὲ ἐληλύθει ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν κώμην (J. XI.30, at the beginning of a sentence);²⁰ (9) **ni-þ[(u)h]-þat-ei sijaina fraiw Abrahamis, allai barna** “Nor because they are his descendants are they all Abraham’s children” = οὐδ’ ὅτι εἰσὶν σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, πάντες τέκνα (R. IX.7; beginning of the sentence); (10) **ni-s[(u)h]-sijai** “may this never be” = μὴ γένοιτο (L. XX.16); this is a separate sentence in which the final verbal form seems to be unstressed (as was normal for Germanic and Indo-European) and which enters the enclitic group, since there are no other words between the final verb and the initial group; (11) (**ip̄ Iesus**) **uz-uh-hof augona iup** “(and then Jesus) looked up = raised his eyes” = (ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς) ἤρην τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἄνω (J. XI.41,²¹ after **us-hofun** “they took away” = ἤραν in the preceding sentence); (12) **us-nu-gibiþ** “then give” = ἀποδότε (L. XX.25, beginning of direct speech); (13) **uz-uh himina was þau uz-uh mannā** “was it from heaven or from men” = ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἦν ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων (Mk. XI.30, a prepositional nominal phrase²² structurally similar to verbal complexes, cf. also **uz-u waurstwam witodis** “whether by observing the law” = ἐξ ἔργων νόμου (Gal. III.2), with a completely different type of interrogative structure in Greek; to **uz-u** compare also the similar structure in **ab-u** < preposition **af/b-** + **u**, J. XVIII.34); (14) **ub-uh-wopida** “he called out” = καὶ ἐβόησεν (L. XVIII.38, at the beginning of a sentence; the structure is quite different from the Greek original; cf. **jah uf-wopida** “and she exclaimed” = καὶ ἀνεφώνησεν, L. I.42; **uf-wopida** = ἀνεβόησεν, L. IX.38).

It is possible to describe such Gothic complexes in terms of rank grammar. In complexes with a single preverb, the first rank is assigned to the preverbs **ga-** (1-4 above)/**diz-** (5 above)/**us-** (11-13 above)/**uf-** (14 above) and the sentence negative **ni-** (6-10 above).

¹⁹ See on this sentence Klein, Condon 1993, p. 29.

²⁰ On the function of **-uh þan** in such sentences where it refers to background information, cf. Klein 1994, pp. 262-273. On the sentential value of **nih þan** in L. IX.3 see ib., p. 270. On **þan-uh** see ib., pp. 258-262.

²¹ See on this sentence Klein, Condon 1993, p. 13.

²² Cf. Klein, Condon 1993, p. 9 a. o.

Etymologically, **ga-** is identical to the archaic Latin **com-/gon-** < ***kom** that is very often met with in a similar function, i.e. as a perfectivizing preverb in verbal constructions, as in such archaic texts as the inscription of the collegium of Faliscan cooks (CIL I² 364). The initial pretonic position accounts for the voicing of the initial ***k-** > Gmc **g-/γ-** according to Verner's law (the low tone reconstructed for the IE enclitics/proclitics may be connected to voicedness, according to a general phonetic principle). Initial position is also characteristic for the corresponding element in Celtic, i.e. Old Irish **con-** corresponding to Latin **c/gom-**; the same feature may also be reconstructed on the basis of archaic prepositional phrases with the preposition **kūn/kū**²³ in Proto-Slavic. In partly comparable verbal constructions a similar word order is found in some later dialects of Northern Anatolian, as with Lydian **kan-tro**.²⁴ But in Hittite, as in Vedic, the position of this perfectivizing particle in an enclitic chain is always final: Hittite **nu-kan** = Vedic **nú-kam**, cf. Greek *νύ κεϵ*,²⁵ Old Hittite **šu-kan** = Vedic **sú-**

²³ On the prepositional phrases that preserve the final vowel (Russian *k nemu* "to him" < **kūn jemu*) cf. Hill 1977.

²⁴ Melchert 1994, p. 340, with references.

²⁵ The comparison was suggested already by Wackernagel, Debrunner 1930, p. 568; on the history of the problem and on difficulties caused by discrepancies between dialects see: Watkins 1997, pp. 618-619; Dunkel 1990, p. 115 ff.; cf. also the remark by Hrozný 1916, p. 32: "Das *kán* ... möchte ich mit ai. *kám*, *kam*, gr. *κεϵ* ... zusammenstellen". On the final position (or postposition) of **kam** in Vedic see: Delbrück 1888, pp. 146, 150; Macdonell 1972, p. 31; Dunkel 1990, pp. 117-120; on **sú** see Klein 1982. Vedic combinations follow another unstressed word: **Vişṇor nú kam vīrīāṇi prá vocam** "I will now proclaim the heroic powers (feats) of Vishnu" (RV I.154.1a — a line with an archaic anagrammatic reproduction of the initial **v[i]**- of Vishnu's name, Elizarenkova 1989, p. 638). The place of **nu** in the Vedic sentence is always second comparable to that in Greek and also in Germanic (see on Gothic **nu** below). But this addition to the Indo-European pattern so strictly preserved in Hittite might have been caused by a later development, see some examples of the apparent rearrangement of the particles *κεϵ* and *ὄν* in Greek, as studied by C. J. Ruijgh. A completely untenable position seems to be that held by George Dunkel, who suggests, in his study of these two particles, that they reflect two different words, one of which is represented by Vedic **kam** = Hittite **kan**, and another (with different meaning) by Gothic **ga-** and Latin **com-** (Dunkel 1990, pp. 115-122).

kam. Hittite has the element **kan** between a preceding noun in the Dative-Locative case and a following postposition **anda**: {N_{DAT-LOC} + **kan** ⊕ **anda**}, cf. the Vedic construction of a noun in the Dative with a postposed tonic **kám**. To the latter one can compare the final position of Latin **-cum** in the archaic prepositional constructions **me-cum** “with me”, **te-cum** “with you” and Umbrian **vuku-cum** “at the grove (Abl.)”.²⁶ The latter cases show an inverted word order in comparison to nearly synonymous Slavic constructions like Russian *k rošče* “to the grove”. It can be suggested that the Indo-European particle/adverbial element ***kom** could be used both as an enclitic or as a proclitic. Each of the dialects or dialectal groups developed either predominantly enclitic final position of this morph in a chain of particles, as in Hittite, or an initial one as in Gothic. But despite such differences in the order of elements, it is possible to reconstruct an Indo-European prototype such as ***kom** + (... +) ***sok^w**- “to see (perfective aspect)” for a combination like Gothic **ga-sailvan** “seen” (**ga-sailvanane**, 2 C. IV.18 = *βλεπόμενα*) = Hittite **-kan** + (**katta**) **šakuwai-**, in an archaic Middle Hittite poetic text: **nu-kán** ^DUTU-uš **ne-pí-sa-az kat-ta ša-ku-wa-it** “and the God of the Sun looked down from the sky” (The Song of Ullikummi, I Table, A IV 33; reconstruction after Güterbock).

A Germanic-Celtic-Baltic (Old Lithuanian) isogloss (possibly based on a common preservation of an archaism) is constituted by the use of the negative ***ně/*nē**-²⁷ as an introductory (sentence) negative, after which enclitic particles follow. This use was also possible in Vedic and Mycenaean Greek, but Hittite and Anatolian in general shows an innovation (Hittite **na-tta** may begin a sentence with enclitics following it, but the negative itself is probably an old compound).

Among Gothic enclitic elements, the interrogative particle **-u**-²⁸ has an exact correspondence in Vedic **u** “and, also” and Homeric Greek *αὐ*.²⁹ Gothic **-nu-** is used in the second position (12 above), as in many cases in Baltic (Latvian **nu**),

²⁶ Mentioned by Watkins 1997, pp. 619-620, who is cautious in his attitude towards the etymology of the particle. On the Italic material, see also C. Wilhelm, “Word Order Change ...”, this volume.

²⁷ Neckel 1913.

²⁸ Jones 1958; 1959.

²⁹ Klein 1982, 1987; 1989; Klein, Condon 1993, pp. 34-46.

Vedic, Arcado-Cypriote (*ō-vv*) and Phrygian,³⁰ Tocharian A **pat nu** (versus Hittite **nu-pat**, and in an identical Baltic combination: Old Lithuanian **nuo-pat**). This element ***n-u/o** usually introduces sentences in Hittite and verbal complexes in Old Irish and Balto-Slavic (where in Lithuanian it may be both enclitic and proclitic); see below on the Gothic construction with an enclitic verb or noun.

Gothic **-lva-** (2 above) preserves its connection to an interrogative/indefinite (originally perhaps relative) pronoun, but at the same time can be compared to enclitic particles in different Indo-European languages (cf. the prehistory of Gothic **-uh**, particularly in combinations like **ni-h** < ***ne-k^we**³¹ = Latin **ne-que**). After analyzing the data, Gonda came to the conclusion that “an indefinite **lva-** and the complementary-correspondive **-(u)h** developed into **lvazuh** ‘everybody’, the more so as in other cases this pronoun may be taken to represent an ‘if somebody’ ... If the Hittite **kuiški** ‘somebody’ really contains **ki** < **k^we** ... it may perhaps be considered a parallel”.³² In Old Hittite the pronoun **kui-** may be put into the unstressed position. In Palaic and Luwian a related element **kuwa-** serves as an enclitic. The same Indo-European and Proto-Germanic syntactic structure,³³ with the second element derived from the Indo-European relative/interrogative ***k^wo-**, is also reflected in some Gothic compound pronominal forms, as (15) **þis-lvad-uh** (+ **þad-ei**) **gaggis** “wherever you go” = ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ, Mt. VIII.19/+ **þ-ei gaggaiþ** “whenever you enter” = ὅπου ἐὰν εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς οἰκίαν, Mk. VI.10); (16) **þis-lvah** (+ **þat-ei** “whatever” = ὅ ἐάν, Mk. VII.11); (17) **þis-lvar-uh** (+ **þ-ei** “whenever” = ὅπου ἄν, Mk. IX.18; = ὅπου ἐάν “wherever”, Mk. XIV.9); (18) **þis-lvaz-uh** (**þis-lvad-uh** + **ei** “whomever, anyone” = ὅτι ὅς ἄν, Mk. XI.23, at the beginning of a syntactic phrase; cf. **lvaz-uh** “everyone” + **sa-ei** “everyone who” = πᾶς ὁ, at the beginning of a sentence: L. XX.18); **þis-lvamme-h** + **sa-ei** “whomever” = ὅς ... ἄν, Mk. IV.25; **jah þis-lvamme-h þ-ei** “and to anyone” = καὶ ᾧ ἐάν, L. IV.6); **þis-lvano-h sa-ei** “whomever” = ὅστις

³⁰ Watkins 1962, p. 17; Ivanov 1965, pp. 236, 242. See also above on the combination with ***kom**.

³¹ Klein, Condon 1993, p. 49 (the article provides a detailed discussion of the use of **-uh** together with an etymological study, according to which it is traced back to ***[a]u-k^we**); Klein 1994, p. 255, fn. 6; cf. Dunkel 1992, p. 167.

³² Gonda 1975, p. 318.

³³ On the probable unaccentuated character of this element see Prokosch 1939, pp. 278-279.

ǎv, Mt. X.33), (19) **pata-lvah** “whatever” = ð éáv, J. XV.7 (cf. **pat-upl=h-l-pan** “this” = τοῦτο, 1 Tim. II.3, where the Gothic text seems to add another emotional shade to the beginning of the sentence); (20) **sa-lvaz-uh sa-ei** “whoever” = ðs éáv, L. IX.48 (cf. the same construction with +nu inserted in the middle: Mt. X.32); (21) **du-lve** “why” (Mt. IX.4; at the beginning of a sentence in the interpolation in L. IX.43) and parallel **du-þe/ du-h-þe/ du-p-þe < du-uh-þe** “for that reason” = διὰ τοῦτο, 1 Tim. I.16; J. VI.65, at the beginning of Jesus’ direct speech/+ ei after a Vocative, L. I.13; cf. also **bi-lve** “how” = κατὰ τί, L I.18, at the beginning of a direct question).

The Indo-European pronominal stems in *t- as reflected in Gothic in 15-19 and *so- (Runic sa-) as in 20 are related to sentence-introducing elements in Old Hittite, Baltic (Old Lithuanian) and Slavic, and Celtic; in Anatolian, cf. Old Hittite š-, ta- as sentence-introducing words, and in Celtic, note Gaulish so- in demonstrative function: σο-σιν νεμητων, **so-sin celicnon**.³⁴ The initial ja- in Gothic (cognate to Runic ja[h]) is found in (22) **ja-h** “and, also” = καί (as most frequently),³⁵ 23) **ja-d-du/ ja-h-du** “and to” (2 C. II.16, at the beginning of a syntactic phrase that starts with καί in Greek; cf. **japþe < ja-h-þe** “either or”), (24) **ja-u**, interrogative word (J. VII.48, at the beginning of a direct question after sai). Gothic ja- is genetically identical to a similar initial element (from the relative pronoun *yo-³⁶) in Mycenaean Greek (j)o-, Phrygian (ios), and Balto-Slavic (Latvian Debitive, Proto-Slavic *jakŭ = Hit. ya-kku = Gothic jah³⁷), probably also in Southern Anatolian (Luwian a-), whereas in Northern Anatolian (Hittite) and Tocharian A, comparable conjunctions are always enclitic, as also with Balto-Slavic pronouns in constructions with adjectives equivalent to those which are found in Vedic. The sequence of Gothic ja-h + enclitic verb in (25) **jal/ jah liban** “and to live = life” = καὶ τοῦ ζῆν (2 C. I.8) is identical to the type of Mycenaean

³⁴ Gaulish -sin may be a match for Hit. -šan; Watkins 1997, p. 618.

³⁵ Greek καί is regularly rendered by ja-h: 487 of 494 cases in the Gospels (Klein, Condon 1993, p. 2).

³⁶ Gonda 1975, pp. 164-204.

³⁷ Eichner 1971; Ivanov 1979, p. 76; Klein, Condon 1993, pp. 47, 58, fn. 38. These facts seem important in the light of remarks by Wackernagel 1955a, cf. Dunkel 1990, pp. 100ff.; on the symmetrical *to-k^we (Hit. ta-kku) in Germanic (Modern German doch) see: Dunkel 1992, p. 167.

Greek **jo-do-so-si**. The same type of enclitic verb is present in Gothic (26) **lva nu-k[=h]-kant** “how do you know” = *τί γὰρ οἶδας* (1 C. VII.16, in the beginning of a sentence with obligatory second position for **nu**, see above), identical to the pattern of Old Hittite **nu-maldahhun** “I prayed”, Old Irish **no-feidtis**, Old Church Slavonic **ny-imatŭ**, see above on the position of ***nu-** as a first element and the change occurring in Vedic and Hittite. In the position after the introductory ***yo-** or ***nu-**, an enclitic noun may be used both in Gothic — (27) **ja-b[=h]-brusts** “and your affection (literally breast)” = *καὶ τὰ σπλάγχνα* (2 C. VII.15) — and in Old Hittite — **nu-šakuwa-tet** “and your eyes”.

The enclitic position of the verb after an introductory pronoun related to Indo-European ***to-** is clear in cases like **pat-ist** “in other words = that is” = *τοῦτ' ἐστίν* (R. IX.8, at the beginning of a sentence); comparable facts can be found in Old Russian conversational speech.³⁸

If the verb is put in initial position, the enclitic elements follow it according to Wackernagel’s law³⁹: (28) **was-up[=uh]-pan Iohannes gawasip̄s taglam ulbandaus** “John wore (= was dressed in) clothing made of camel’s hair” = *ἦν δὲ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου* (Mk. I.6, at the beginning of a sentence; here and in the following examples a loan-translation from the Greek seems probable)/ **was-uh pan hulundi** “it was a cave” = *ἦν δὲ σπήλαιον* (J. XI.38, at the beginning of a sentence); (29) **wesun-up[=uh]-pan** “were (present)” = *ἦσαν δέ* (Mk. VIII.9, at the beginning of a sentence; Greek influence seems possible here); (30) **sijaiḫ-pan** “let it (the word)” = *ἔστω δέ* (Mt. V.37, initial position); (31) **bidjandans-up-pan** “(while) praying” = *προσευχόμενοι δέ* (Mt. VI.7, sentence-initial). The closest parallels are presented by Tocharian enclitics following a verb and Old Lithuanian reflexive verbs without a prefix. The same behavior at the beginning of a sentence is exhibited by predicate nouns with modal meaning: (32) **skuld-u ist** “is it permitted (lawful, right)” = *ἔξεστί* (Mk. XII.14); in this case the structure differs from the Greek original. A pronominal adjective can also combine with following enclitics: (33) **sumz-up[=h]-pan** “another” = *ὄς δέ* (1 C.

³⁸ Zaliznjak 1985, pp. 154-158.

³⁹ On the different cases in which **-uh** is used after a verbal form, see the analysis in Klein, Condon 1993, pp. 6-8, 13 a.o.

XI.21 A).⁴⁰ From a purely formal point of view, such a structure combining an adjective with an enclitic (see also the participle in 31 above) can be compared to the Balto-Slavic pronominal adjectives; for them also a semantic parallel may be found in Germanic.⁴¹

This archaic system — practically identical to the dialectal Indo-European one — coexists with another, which is characterized by the possibility of having two preverbs in sequence according to cyclic rules, as in Hittite, Balto-Slavic and Celtic. In preverb combinations, including privative **un-** and **ja-h-** with a following **-ga-**, the latter becomes enclitic: (34) **faura-ga-sandida** “I was sending” = ἔπεμψα (2 C. IX.3); (35) **un-ga-sailvanamma** “invisible” = ἀοράτω (1 Tim. I.17); (36) **ni fairweitjandam þizei ga-sailvanane, ak þizei un-ga-sailvanane; unte þo ga-sailvanona riurja sind, iþ þo un-ga-sailvanona aiweina** “So we fix our eyes not on what is seen, but on what is unseen. For what is seen is temporary, but what is unseen is eternal” = μὴ σκοπούντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα· τὰ γὰρ βλεπόμενα πρόσκαιρα, τὰ δὲ μὴ βλεπόμενα αἰώνια (2 C. IV.18); (37) **jag-ga-traua** “and believe (trust)” = καὶ πέπεισμαι (R. XIV.14). For the combination **un-ga-** one may suggest a semantic parallel in Celtic: cf. OI **ni-con-**, with the same relationship between the negative and a preverb that can be traced back to an IE particle.

Thus, in many of the cases cited above, a verbal complex appears in sentence-initial position, reminiscent of the original syntactic patterning in Indo-European. In certain other cases, a similar structure is reproduced only at the morphological level, where the scope of the rules is no longer the sentence, but a verbal phrase or an individual verbal form. Still, the etymologies of the constituents together with the pattern as a whole prove the Indo-European origin of these constructions.⁴²

⁴⁰ Cf. on **sumaih þan** “and some” in J. VII.44: Klein 1994, p. 272.

⁴¹ Wijk 1935; Haudry 1981.

⁴² This article represents an expanded version of an invited lecture presented at the Berkeley Germanic Linguistics Roundtable, University of California, Berkeley, April 3 1998. For various comments and suggestions, the author is indebted to the Berkeley audience and to those who read the paper in draft form, in particular to Irmengard Rauch and Brent Vine.

References

- Bally, Charles. 1945/1997. *Manuel d'accentuation grecque*. Berne: A. Francke (repr. Georg, 1997).
- Brugmann, Karl. 1913-1914. Das gotische Partikel *-uh, -h*. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 33.173-180.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1888. *Altindische Syntax*. Halle-Saale.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1893-1900. *Vergleichende Syntax. Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Bd. III-V. Straßburg.
- Dillon, Miles. 1947. Celtic and the Other Indo-European Languages. *Transactions of the Philological Society* (London), 15-24.
- Dunkel, George E. 1990. J. Wackernagel und die idg. Partikel **só, *ke, *kem* und **an*, in Eichner and Rix 1990, 101-130.
- Dunkel, George E. 1992. Die Grammatik der Partikeln. *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie* (Akten der VII Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden, 1987). Innsbruck (IBS 65).
- Eichner, H. 1971. Urindogermanisch **k^we* "wenn" im Hethitischen. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 29.27-46
- Eichner, H., and H. Rix (eds.). 1990. *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: J. Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute* (Basel Colloquium 1988). Basel.
- Elizarenkova, Tat'jana Ja. (transl.). 1989. *Rig Veda*, Mandaly I-IV. Moscow: Nauka.
- Gamkrelidze, Thomas and Vyacheslav Ivanov. 1995. *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans*, vols. I-II. Berlin-New York: De Gruyter.
- Gonda, J. 1975. *Selected Studies*, vol. I (Indo-European Linguistics). Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Hale, Mark. 1987. Notes on Wackernagel's Law in the Language of the Rigveda. *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill* (ed. Calvert Watkins), 38-50. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Haudry, Jean. 1981. Les deux flexions de l'adjectif germanique. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* LXXVI/1.191-200.

- Hill, Steven P. 1977. *The N-Factor and Russian Prepositions. Their Development in 11th-20th Century Texts*. The Hague-Paris: Mouton.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. 1973. Studies of the Hittite Particles, I. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93/4.520-526.
- Hrozný, Friedrich. 1916. *Die Sprache der Hethiter, ihr Bau und Zugehörigkeit zum indogermanischen Sprachstamm. Ein Entzifferungsversuch*. Boghazköi-Studien, hrsg. von Otto Weber, 1. Heft, 1. Lief.. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.
- Ivanov, Vyacheslav V. 1958. The Importance of the New Data of Hittite and Tocharian. *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists*. Oslo: University of Oslo.
- Ivanov, Vjačeslav V. 1959. Toxarskie jazyki i ix značenie dlja sravnitel'no-istoričeskogo issledovanija indoevropejskix jazykov. *Toxarskie jazyki* (ed. V. V. Ivanov), 5-37.
- Ivanov, Vjačeslav V. 1965. *Obščeeindoevropejskaja, praslavjanskaja i anatolijskaja jazykovyje sistemy*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Ivanov, Vyacheslav V. 1979. Syntactic Archaisms of Old Hittite. *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch* (ed. E. Neu and W. Meid), 73-78. Innsbruck (IBS 25).
- Jones, Oscar F. 1958. The interrogative Particle *-u* in Germanic. *Word* 14/2-3.213-223.
- Jones, Oscar F. 1959. "Art thou he who has to come". *Festschrift für J. G. Kunstmann*.
- Josephson, Folke. 1972. *The Function of Sentence Particles in Old and Middle Hittite*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Uppsaliensis.
- Josephson, Folke. 1976. On the function of the Gothic Preverb *ga-*. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 81.152-175.
- Josephson, Folke. 1995. Directionality in Hittite. *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume, Part One* (ed. W. Smoczyński), 165-176. Cracow: Universitas.
- Josephson, Folke. 1997. Review of J. Boley, *The Sentence Particles and the Place Words in Old and Middle Hittite*. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* LIV/1-2.155-160.
- Klein, Jared S. 1978. *The Particle u in the Rigveda. A Synchronic and*

- Diachronic Study*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (KZ Erg. 27). Klein, Jared S. 1982. Rigvedic *tú* and *sú*. *Sprache* 28.1-26.
- Klein, Jared S. 1989. Homeric Greek *av̄*: A Synchronic, Diachronic, and Comparative Study. *Historische Sprachforschung*. 101.249-288.
- Klein, Jared S. 1992. On the Idiomatic Nature of the Gothic New Testament: A Comparative Study of Prepositional Usage in Gothic and New Testament Greek. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 90/1.1-80.
- Klein, Jared S. 1994. Gothic *paruh*, *panuh* and *-(u)h pan*. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 99.253-276.
- Klein, Jared S., and Nancy L. Condon. 1993 Gothic *-u(h)*: A Synchronic and Comparative Study. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 91.1-62.
- Krisch, Thomas. 1990. Das Wackernagelsche Gesetz aus heutigen Sicht, in Eichner and Rix 1990, 64-81.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. 1986. *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- McCone, Kim Robert. 1979. *Aspects of Indo-European Sentence Patterns and their Role in the Constitution of the Old Irish Verbal System*. Oxford, D.Phil. Diss.
- Macdonell, Arthur Anthony. 1972. *A Vedic Reader for Students*. Madras: Oxford University Press (8th impression).
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1994a. Anatolian. *Langues indo-européennes* (ed. F. Bader). Paris.
- Moulton, Harold K. 1978. *The Analytical Greek Lexicon Revised*. Regency Reference Library. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Neckel, Gustav. 1913. Zu den germanischen Negationen. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 45.1-23.
- Prokosch, Eduard. 1939. *A Comparative Germanic Grammar*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America and University of Pennsylvania.
- Sommer, Ferdinand. 1947. *Hethiter und Hethitisch*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Sturtevant, Edgar H. 1939. The Pronoun **so*, *sā*, *tod* and the Indo-Hittite Hypothesis. *Language* 15.11-19.
- Sturtevant, Edgar H. 1952. The Prehistory of Indo-European: A Summary.

- Language 28/2, part 1.
- Sturtevant, Edgar H., and Adelaide Hahn. 1951. *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language 1* (rev. ed.). Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.
- Wackernagel, Jakob. 1879. Über einige enclitische Nebenformen der Personalpronomina. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 24.592-609.
- Wackernagel, Jakob. 1955. Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Kleine Schriften*, Bd.I, 1-103 (= IF 1 [1892] 333-436). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wackernagel, Jakob. 1955a. Idg. **q^we* als Nebensatzeinleitende Konjunktion. *Ib.*, 257-261.
- Wackernagel, Jakob, and Albert Debrunner. 1930. *Altindische Grammatik*, Bd. III. Nominalflexion, Zahlwort, Pronomen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (repr. 1975).
- Watkins, Calvert. 1962. Preliminaries to a Historical Analysis of the Syntax of the Old Irish Verb. *Celtica* VI.1-49.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1964. Preliminaries to the Reconstruction of Indo-European Sentence Structure. *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists* (Cambridge, Mass.), 1035-1045.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1997. Delbrück and the Syntax of Hittite and Luvian: Predictive Power. *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy* (Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft, Madrid, 1994; ed. Emilio Crespo and José Luis García Ramón), 611-630. Madrid-Wiesbaden: Ediciones de la UAM/Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Wijk, Nicolaas van. 1935. Eine slavisch-germanische syntaktische Parallele. *Germanoslavica* (Prague) 3.19-30.
- Zaliznjak, Andrej A. 1986. Novgorodskie berestjanye gramoty s lingvističeskoj točki zrenija, in V. L. Janin and A. A. Zaliznjak, *Novgorodskie gramoty na bereste iz raskopok 1977-1983 godov*, 89-219. Moscow: Nauka.
- Zaliznjak, Andrej A. 1993. K izučeniju jazyka berestjanyx gramot, in V. L. Janin and A. A. Zaliznjak, *Novgorodskie gramoty na bereste iz raskopok 1984-1989 godov*, 191-318. Moscow: Nauka.

Zaliznjak, Andrej A. 1995. *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt*. Moscow: Škola
“Jazyki russkoj kul'tury”.