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AVANT-PROPOS

Sans doute n’y avait-il guère plus de différence entre la langue du Mède Décès, celle du Perse Téispès et celle de l’Indien Sudâs 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) 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.
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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 ύπόταξις, 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 Alexandrinian grammarian Apollonios Dyskolos uses the term ύπόταξις as a grammatical term denoting the placing of a pronoun or an adverb behind the word to which it refers. As the opposite of ύπόταξις 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 Thiersch 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 ύπόταξις was used as the opposite of παράταξις2.

1. E.g. De Pronominibus, Grammatici Graeci II 1, p.116,5; De Adverbiis, ibid. p.125,6ff.: Μηδὲ ἐκεῖνός γε παράλλελον ἡμῶν, τι δὴ ποτε, εἰ καὶ ἐν ύπόταξις ἐστι τὰ ἐκπρήματα τοῦ ρήματος καὶ ἐν πρόταξις, ἀπὸ τοῦ προτετάχθαι τὴν ὀνομασίαν ἐλαβε ‘...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 Old Avesta by Jean Kellens 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 ²1990, 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 conjunctional, 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.


7. See Rix, Fs Szemerényi 730-735.

Les textes vieill-avестiques. 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/ro-: OAv. hiθat, YAv yaθ, Ved. yād; OAv. yāθ, Ved. yād, yāsmāθ ‘since’; YAv. yahmiiθ ‘where’, OP yanaθi ‘while, whereby’; YAv. yahmāθ ‘until’.

b) Derivatives from the relative pronoun: OAv. yaθaθ, YAv. yaθaθ ‘how’, OP yaθaθ, Ved. yāθhā; OAv. yaθrā, YAv. yaθrā, Ved. yārā ‘where, to which place’; Ved. yāras ‘from where’; OAv. yaθd, Ved. yaθd ‘when’; YAv. yaθdīt (< yaθaθ + iθ) ‘as far as’; OP yaθd ‘where’ (< *jaθa-dha); YAv. yeθi ‘if, when’, OP yadθi, Ved. yāθd; OAv. yeθ ‘if’, YAv. yeθi; OAv. yāθ, Ved. yād ‘as far as’; OAv. ’yāθ ‘as far as’; OP yaθd ‘until’; OAv. YAv. yauθaθ ‘as long, as far as’ (also Istr. Sg. OAv. (Y 43.8) yauθaθ, YAv. yauθata), OP yāθaθ, Ved. yāvāθ, cf. Gk. ἐως ‘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, cέd (*ca-id) introducing a subordinate clause.

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 (yeθ), 187-9 (hiθat). 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 "Avestasprache und Altpersisch" in Grundzüge 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 altbaskischen Sprache, Leipzig 1867, Reichel's Elementarbuch and Kent's Grammar of Old Persian which include syntax.

10. Xerxes, Van 22 (cf. Kent, Old Persian p.153): uta ima stānam hauv niyaθθāya kantanaθi yamaθi dipim naiθ nipiθθām akauθus ‘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 yamaθi < *yaθθā (Instr.Sg.) + iθ.  id.

11. On OAv. yāθ, ved. yāθ see Narten, YH 166.

12. See on this Narten, YH 119-120 and below with fn. 19.
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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 Old Avesta by KELLENS/PIRART it emerges that the only type of subordination with conjunctions that is at all frequent is the clause introduced by *hīiat. KELLENS/PIRART II 332 list 44 instances of this type. Next in frequency is yez†, which goes back to a combination of yat and the particle zt ( < *Ihr. *iad-žhi); yez† 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 yadā 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 Haptaññāiti: There are only two subordinate clauses and they are both introduced by *hīiat (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: yastrā ‘where’ (nine times)18, yauwat ‘how much’, yāt ‘as far as, insofar’ Y 32.4 (< *iäh-ütr), *yāt 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 *hīiat, but also the number of subordinate clauses introduced by *hīiat 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 *hīiat 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 *hīiat and a.
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 aśa friād dazdiāt hākurānā ‘Let friendly fellowships be granted us by truth
(e) yadā nā a vohā jimat manapāhā so that one may come to us with good thought.’ (HUMBACH, Gāthās 1 156).
17. yadā 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 aśa.
18. In Y 31.12 *armaitis mainiitā *parasaitē yastrā maśādā KELLENS/PIRART II 291 consider yastrā as an indirect interrogative. However, it can also be interpreted with HUMBACH, Gāthās 1 129 as a relative adverb ‘where’: ‘right-mindedness takes counsel with the spirit where (right-mindedness is) present’.
19. According to NARTEN, YH 120 *yāt Y 37.3 is a genitive dependent on isānaidē ‘zu wieviel wir instande 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 manasct hīiat vahistām; 32.5b hīiat vā akā manapāhā yāng daēuṣaŋ akascā mainiīut ‘because the evil spirit along with evil thought (had lured) you, the Daēvas’; 34.4 tātī šiiaōanaitis yātī vahistātą ‘through the actions that (are) the best’; Y 45.8: viiḍaraśām ... yām mazām ahuram ‘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 conjonctional subordinator is yat. Thus, for instance, in Yt 19 yat occurs in 26 instances as a subordinating conjunction in temporal, causal, final and consecutive function; next in frequency comes yezí, which occurs four times in Yt 19 to introduce a conditional or a temporal subordinate clause; yâdâ is attested three times as a causal or final subordinator, and yâdâ yat once to introduce a consecutive clause. Thus, only yat, yezí and yâdâ are used as segmental subordinators in Yašt 19, and among them yat is - as in the Older Avesta - by far the commonest.

A similar situation is found in Yašt 5: here also only the three conjunctions yat, yâdâ and yezí are used as subordinators: yat occurs 13 times, yâdâ 16 times and yezí once. The relatively frequent use of yâdâ besides yat is explained by the recurrent formula awwât âliaptam dazdi mê vâh’hi swûîste arduwat sûre ânhîte ‘Give me that boon, o good, strongest Arduwî Sûrân Anîhîtâ’, where the following subordinate clause is introduced indifferently by yat or by yâdâ.

Subordinated conjonctional clauses are even more rare in Yašt 8, although it must be taken into consideration that it is a smaller text: here yat is found only twice and yâdâ once seen ... him, the Wise Ahura’. The nominal relative groupe may be a genitive attribute, as e.g. 31.6b maqâram yim hauruutárâ ‘the formula concerning integrity’; 46.1d dašišiš yî jiâr sâtârâ drašgvaánto ‘the deceitful tyrants of the land’; 46.3a yî ušânâd asnaq ‘bulls of the day’; 46.8a yî vâ mój yâ gâstâ dazdê ‘ânhîhê ‘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 vâdô. dâm dašnîhî abîissaq ahâm yâ vâh’hi swûîste manaqhô ‘accept with (your) religious view, and in accordance with them, the existence which (is) that good thought’ (all translations by HUMBACH, Gâtáhá3). See on this also HETTRICH, Hypotaxe 786ff.; KOCH, Indogermanisch, Slawisch und Baltschisch 71.

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

23. yat introduces a final clause in the formula awwât âliaptam dazdi mê ... yat bauuâni aîjî. vaniîd ... ‘give me that boon; ... that I may overcome ...’. Yt 5.34, 38, 50 (yat wîsânâm xuyxanâm âzam frûtâm dûëgjilîni (that I may gear the first of all teams’), 54, 58 (bauuâna), 73, 82, 109, 113, 117, yat introduces an explicative clause in Yt 5,65 mû şit dast dârzyât yat frûtâtaiat dëbaxdô xo qam ahuruwâdâm ‘it was soon, not late, and in an active state, that he came close to the earth created by the Lord...’, and 76: tê bâ aîa tê aîsasé ... yat mâ awwát daëuvaiaisnâm nijatam yâdâ sûrâm 4 varasâm yûtâm yût ‘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 bâtuny viást vâh’hatam ... yat asti bârîsir swadhêsa yâdâ yast asti gaonôtma ‘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. yâdâ introduces a final clause in the phrase awwât âliaptam dazdi mê ... yâdâ ... in Yt 5.18, 22 (twice), 28 (twice), 30, 42, 46, 50, 54, 69 (: yâdâ azam awwatu varsihre hacâmê yâdâ wîse pe aniiie aiir ‘daß ich eines so großen Siegs teilhaftig werde wie alle anderen Arier (zusammen’), 105, 130, 127 (: hâ hé 4madim niitêzata yâbaca hukosapat fûtâna yâbaca agsân 4 niitêzana ‘Sie hat sich die Taille geschmückt, damit die Brüste wohlgeformt (und) damit sie geschmückt seien’), 132 (: yâdà tê wîsê avruumânta zaszêhâ paiti jasân ‘damit alle diese Renner siegreich heimkehren wie...’). yâdâ yat ‘insofar’: Yt 5,129 yâdâ yast asti gaonôtma ‘insofern es (das Biberweibchen) am dichtesten behaart ist’ (see end of fn.23).

25. Yt 5,63: barâni aoi dâpm yam raqham yezí jum frapaiemi aoi yam ahuraâdâm ‘I will bring (a thousand libations) to the River Raqhâ, if I reach alive the earth created by the Lord’. 55
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 aem bauwaiti yaštō ‘when he is being worshipped’; in its other attestation, Yt 8.60, it introduces a conditional clause ‘if’. 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 yeiði zt (Yt 8.11, 24, 52, 56). However, a hypothetic period is also found in Yt 10, one of the oldest Yaštś. In that hymn yeiði zt 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); next in frequency comes yezi, attested five times, then yat (three times as a temporal subordinator), and finally once yauwata ‘until’ (Yt 10.71). Leaving aside the repeated phrases there are altogether 13 different conjunctural 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinating Conjunctions in the Avesta</th>
<th>hiitāf yat</th>
<th>yezi</th>
<th>yadā</th>
<th>yaθa</th>
<th>yaθa yat</th>
<th>yeiði zt</th>
<th>yauwata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older Avesta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gā- thās</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Avesta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yt 19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yt 5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yt 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yt 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10 (7 re.)</td>
<td>2 (1 rep.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. yat 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 graṇṭo upaṭhītiṣṭo ... ‘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 sē zoarθā braraiti auui sē maθθamn ‘when he takes his libations to his abode’ (GERSHEVITCH)), and twice a conditional clause ‘if’ (Yt 10.18, 137); on yeiði zt 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 35.6:

yaθa dā uta na dā vai nārīt vā 'As men and women know
vaθdā haiθam what is Truth,
aθa haiθ vohū 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 dāt (YH dī) 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.:

parəsət zarə̱stə̱ ahurə̱ mazdaθm... 'Zarə̱stə̱ asked Ahura Mazda...’
dāt mərho ahurə̱ mazdə̱... Then spake Ahura Mazda...
dāt mē aθm paitiə̱oxta... 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:

paθirio̱ gai̱ri̱ hq̱m. hi̱stə̱ ‘The first mountain which arose,
spitaθma zarə̱stə̱ o Spitaθma Zarə̱stə̱,
paiti aθi̱a zomə̱ haraθi̱ barš on this earth was the lofty Harai̱f.
hə̱ hama ‘paθri̱. sarə̱te She lies surrounding both
frə̱paiti daq̱huθ d ūpqo̱sə̱n hə̱sc̱a 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:

yahmi̱a ahurō mazdə̱ ‘Whereby Ahura Mazdə̱
huwa̱p o niuwaθə̱sai̱at of good deeds ordered:
āiθi paiti auu̱an jasaθ ‘Come, come down,
arə̱duθ sūre anə̱hi̱te Arə̱duθ Sūrə Anə̱hita,
haca auuə̱thiθə̱ stə̱rhoθiθ from those stars
aθi zam ahurə̱sə̱tə̱m to the Earth created by the Lord.
θə̱m yazə̱nte auuə̱nə̱nθhō The swift lords,
ahurə̱nθhō daq̱hu.pataiθ the lords of lands,

30. On this verse cf. NARTEN, YH 39, 112f.
puθrāṅhō daθhu.paitinām the sons of the lords of lands will venerate you...’

And in the story of Pāuruua, Yašt 5.62:
ho awauaθa vazata ‘This one (Pāuruua) was floating (through the air) in that way
θri.aliaram θri.xsaparam for three days and three nights
*paitiθa nmānām yim *xʾaθpaiθim31 towards his own house.
nōθ aora *awuaθrisiθiθat He was not to come down.
θraoθta xθaθnō θritiθialā At the completion of the third night
frāνaθ utθhθm sūralā he came to the dawn of the mighty one32,
vīvuitī33 upa utθθm to the Dawn shining out.
upa.zhaiθ at arduuθm sūram anāθiθat He called unto Araduui Śūrā Anāhiṭā:’

5.4. In this last example the verbal form *awuaθrisiθiθat is the 3.Sg.Subj.34 of the present stem uruuθisiθa- ‘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:
yō janaθ aθim sruuaθram... ‘(Karasaśpa), who slew the horn-bearing dragon...
yim upaθiθ karaθsāsθpō Son whom Karasaśpa
aiiaθa pitum paθcata cooked his meal in an iron pot
a rapiθθiθnaθ zruθuθθm around midday.
taćaθc hō maθriθiθ xθtasθca The villain became hot and started sweating;
fras aiaθyθhō fraspaθaθ forwards he kicked against the pot,
yaeθsiaθiθm āpom *pariθhθat he wanted to upset the boiling water.
pariθ tarθθo apataθaθ Frightened manly-minded Karasaśpa
naθreθ maθθaθ karasθsθpō jumped aside.’

As Hoffmann/Narten35 point out, in this example the verse fras aiaθyθhō fraspaθaθ yaesθiθiθm āpom *pariθhθat probably means that he kicked against the pot in order to upset

31. Gellner edits xʾaθpaiθim. Bartholomae, Air. Wb. 1877 reads with F1 xʾaθpaiθem. This form, however, does not account for epenthesis of i. Furthermore, this would be the only attestation of an adjectival stem xʾaθpaiθia- . The form transmitted by F1 xʾaθpaiθem is probably erroneously written instead of xʾaθpaiθim, which F1 transmits in stanza 63 and 65 (here xʾaθpaiθim).
32. usah- sūralā is the name of the third section of the night between midnight and dawn (AirWb.415).
33. vi-uuaitim Akk.Sg.fem. of the present participle active vi-uuant- (with zero-grade root < *bʾ-ant- < *bʾhθ") ent- versus full-grade Ved. bhānt-, see Kellen, Verbe av. 89) from the root *b̥-, Ved. bhātī ‘to shine’.
34. See Hoffmann/Narten, Sasan.Archet. 58 fn.78. Gellner edits with F1 and E1 awuorisiθiθat (J10 has awuorisiθiθat). Bartholomae, AirWb.1534 interprets this form as a subjunctive from the present stem uruusiθiθa- from the root uruues ‘to turn round’ functioning here as a preterite: ‘er vermochte nicht wieder herunter- zukommen’, cf. Lommel, Yāst’s 37 (‘konnte aber nicht herablenken’). Kellen, Verbe av. 268 proposes either to emend the transmitted awuorisiθiθat into an indicative *awuorisiθiθat, 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, too\(^{36}\). The subjunctive in Yt 19.2 fraox\(\tilde{s}\)a\(n\) can also be interpreted in this way:

\((Yt\ 19.1)\ p\(\tilde{a}\)\(i\)\(\tilde{r}\)\(i\)\(\tilde{r}\)\(\tilde{g}\) gair\(i\)\(\tilde{s}\) h\(\tilde{m}\)\(a\)\(m\) hi\(\tilde{s}\)\(t\)\(\tilde{a}\)\(\tilde{t}\)\(\tilde{a}\)... 'The first mountain which arose... p\(\tilde{a}\)\(i\)\(\tilde{t}\)\(\tilde{i}\)\(\tilde{t}\)\(\tilde{i}a\) zam\(\tilde{a}\) harait\(i\) bar\(s\)... on this earth was the lofty Haraiti...

\((Yt\ 19.2)\ h\(\tilde{b}\)\(t\)\(\tilde{i}\)\(\tilde{t}\)\(i\)\(\tilde{t}\)\(\tilde{o}\) z\(\tilde{a}\)\(\tilde{r}\)\(\tilde{a}\)\(d\)\(a\) gair\(i\)\(\tilde{s}\) ... The second mountain was Z\(\tilde{a}\)\(\tilde{r}\)\(\tilde{a}\)\(\tilde{a}\)\(z\)a...

ahm\(\tilde{a}\) ha\(\tilde{c}\)a garai\(\tilde{u}\)\(\tilde{i}\)\(\tilde{o}\) fraox\(\tilde{s}\)\(\tilde{a}\)\(n\) From there were to grow forth the mountains, 'usu\(\tilde{d}\)\(\tilde{a}\) u\(\tilde{s}\)\(\tilde{d}\)\(\tilde{i}\)\(\tilde{a}\)\(\tilde{r}\)\(\tilde{a}\)\(\tilde{r}\)\(a\)\(n\)\(\tilde{e}\)\(\tilde{n}\) etc. U\(\tilde{d}\)\(\tilde{a}\)\(\tilde{h}\)\(\tilde{a}\) Us\(\tilde{i}\)\(\tilde{d}\)\(\tilde{a}\)\(\tilde{r}\)\(a\)\(n\)....'

The verbal form fraox\(\tilde{s}\)\(\tilde{a}\)\(n\) could be seen in relationship to h\(\tilde{m}\)\(a\)\(m\) hi\(\tilde{s}\)\(t\)\(\tilde{a}\)\(\tilde{t}\)\(\tilde{a}\) '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. Hoffmann\(^{37}\) as a voluntable 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 Yaštṣ. 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 conjunctural subordination is largely made by only one conjunction, that is hīi\(\tilde{a}\)\(t\). In the Younger Avesta in general a greater variety of different segmental subordinators is found, but in the Yaštṣ they are only occasionally employed. The number of subordinating conjunctions may even be reduced in individual Yaštṣ. Thus, for instance, only the three conjunctions ya\(\tilde{a}\)\(t\)a, ya\(t\) and ye\(z\)i 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 hypotaxis\(^{38}\). 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 themselves\(^{39}\). 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 ... bardāt 'he wanted to confer, in order to confer'.

37. Der Injunktiv im Veda 244. He quotes, for instance, RV 1 32,5 āhan vṛtrām ... ahiḥ śayate 'He slew Vṛtrā ... the dragon shall lie'.


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 context.  

Viewing the syntactic situation of the Yaštś 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 Yaśś: frequently the Yaśś employ what might be called a paratactical style or technique of composition, in which one narrative element is added to another. 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.
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