# Emergence of Embedded Relative Clauses in Old Persian

Yexin Qu (yq248@cornell.edu)

### 0 Introduction

Some old Indo-European languages like Vedic and Hittite do not make productive use of embedded postnominal relative clauses<sup>1</sup>, unlike modern Romance and modern Germanic languages, where the head noun and the *verbed* relative clause form a complex NP.

Vedic and Hittite strategy:

- Correlative:  $[_{CorC}$  rel-pn ... $]_i$  ... NP $_i$  ...
- (1)  $[_{CorC}$  yéna gácchatha<br/>h sukrto duroṇám] $_i$  REL.INS.SG go.PRES.2DU good-doer.GEN.SG home.ACC.SG

téna $_i$  narā vartír asmábhya yātam DEM.INS.SG man.VOC.DU course.ACC.SG 1PL.DAT go.IMP.2DU

"By which (chariot) you go to the home of the good ritual performer, by that, o men, travel your course to us." (RV 1.117.02cd)

[corc ŠÀ<sup>BI</sup> KUR <sup>URU.d</sup>U-tašša=ya=kan URU.DIDLI.ḤI.A ŚA (2)kuiēš Tarhuntassa=PTC=PTC REL.NOM.PL citv.NOM.PL within land LUGAL KUR <sup>URU</sup>HATTI ešer ... (list of cities) URU Uppaššanaš king land Hatti COP.PRET.3PL Uppassana  $^{\text{L\acute{\text{U}}.MEŠ}}$ MUŠEN. D<br/>Ù. AANAZAG KUR $^{TI} = \text{as} = \text{kan }\bar{\text{e}}$ šzi apūš<br/>š $_i = \text{a} = \text{š}$ ši border land COP they=also=him to pivanteš give.PTCP.PL

"And also the cities within the land of Tarhuntassa which were of the king of Hatti... (list of cities), Uppassana, the augurs ((insofar as) one resides in the border territories), they too are given to him."  $^3$  (Bo 86/299 i 68-77)

- $\bullet$ Extraposed Relative: NP  $_i$  . . . [  $_{\text{RC}}$  rel-pn . . . ]  $_i$
- (3) huvé vaḥ sudyótmānam suvṛktím call.PRES.MID.1SG 2PL.ENCL one.of.good.brilliance.ACC.SG well-twisted.ACC.SG

visám agním $_i$  átithim suprayásam clan.GEN.PL Agni.ACC guest.ACC.SG receiving.good.offering.ACC.SG

[RC mitráḥ iva yáḥ didhiṣáyyaḥ bhút envoy.NOM.SG like REL.NOM.SG desirable.to.install.NOM.SG become.INJ.3SG

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>By embedded, I mean center-embedded as in example (5). Old Hittite may have embedded relative clauses, cf. discussion in Probert (2006:52-3) and Hock (2015:65-6). Vedic also have some examples of embedding, cf. Hock (1989:111-4) and Jamison (2022).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>All Vedic translations are from Jamison & Brereton (2014), unless noted otherwise.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>All Hittite translations are from the data used for Motter (2023).

deváh ádeve jáne jātávedāh] $_i$  god.NOM.SG god-directed.LOC.SG people.LOC.SG Jātavades.NOM

"I call for you upon the one of good brilliance, on Agni, the guest of the clans, who receives well-twisted (hymns), who receives very pleasurable offerings, who, like an envoy, has become desirable to install as god among the god-directed people, as Jātavedas." (RV 2.4.1)

(4) nu=za <sup>d</sup>Kumarbiš<sub>i</sub> GALGA-tar ZI-ni kattan daškizzi CONN=REFL Kumarbi wisdom soul-DAT.SG down take.PRES.3SG

[RC UDKAM-an kuiš LÚ ḪUL-an šallanuškizzi] day.ACC.SG REL.NOM.SG person evil-ACC.SG raise.PRES.3SG

"Kumarbi takes wisdom into his mind, (he) who raises the day as an evil being." (KUB 33.98+ i 4-5)

Romance and Germanic strategy:

- Embedded Relative: ... [NP]  $N_i$  [RC] rel-pn ... [i] ...
- (5) The [NP headway<sub>i</sub> [RC that we made  $t_i$ ]] was satisfactory. (Schachter 1973, attributed to Brame 1968)

Previous literature has hypothesized various directions of the development of relative clauses, however, no one seemed to believe that PIE had center-embedded postnominal restrictive relative clause, except for Ram-Prasad (2022:167) mentioning the possibility for it to exist in PIE but still marginal, and it was probably innovative.

Ram-Prasad's (2022) analysis focused on the reanalysis of ambiguous examples which could be interpreted as either a postposed relative clause or a (non-center-)embedded postnominal relative clause (cf. Hettrich 1988:608, Hock 1989:112-3, Davison 2009):

(6) imám agne śaráṇim mīmṛṣaḥ naḥ this.ACC.SG.F Agni.VOC.SG breach.ACC.SG forget.AOR.CAUS.2SG 1PL.GEN.ENCL

imám ádhvānam $_i$  [RC yám ágāma dārát] this.ACC.SG.M way.ACC.SG REL.ACC.SG come.AOR.1PL distance.ABL.SG

"This (ritual) breach of ours, Agni—make it forgotten; make us forget this way which we have come on from afar." (RV 1.31.16ab)

This suggests that the reanalysis of postposed relative clauses to (non-center-)embedded postnominal relative clauses must be independent in the different branches, and center-embedded relative clause must be developed later. This paper will focus on the Indo-Iranian branch, which offers a case study for the development of embedding due to the varying degrees of freedom to embed in the three oldest attested Indo-Iranian languages, namely Vedic, Avestan, and Old Persian, and provide an alternative mechanism for the development of embedded relative clauses in Old Persian.

### 1 Headedness in Indo-Iranian Relativization

#### 1.1 Headedness

The headedness of a relative construction can be defined in many different ways. For the purpose of this paper, the term headedness is used to describe the headedness of the (cor)relative clause. A (cor)relative clause can be:

1. externally headed: where the head is situated in the host clause (main clause), and the (cor)relative clause does not have an overt head;

```
[_{\text{Host Clause}} \dots \text{ head} \dots] [_{\text{RC}} \text{ rel-pn} \dots]
```

- 2. internally headed: where the head is in the (cor)relative clause without movement; [RC rel-pn ... head ...]
- 3. raised headed: where the head is base generated in the (cor)relative clause but moves to the left periphery of the (cor)relative, preceding the relative pronoun.

```
[_{\text{TopP}} \text{ head}_i [_{\text{RC}} \text{ rel-pn} \dots \frac{\text{head}_i}{i} \dots]]
```

Raised headedness is only possible in languages where there is a Topic Phrase projection in (cor)relative clause as such Vedic.

### 1.2 Vedic

Qu (2020) illustrates that Vedic has all three types:

(7) tám u stuṣe índram $_i$  [ $_{RC}$  yáḥ vídānaḥ] $_i$  DEM.ACC.SG PT praise.1SG Indra.ACC.SG REL.NOM.SG know.MP.NOM.

```
gírvāhasam gīrbhíḥ yajñávṛddham song-vehicled.ACC.SG song.INS.PL sacrifice-strengthed.ACC.SG
```

"I will praise him - Indra, as he is known - whose vehicle is songs, who is strengthened by sacrifice along with songs." (RV 7.21.2ab; externally headed)

(8) índraḥ [Corc yáḥ śúṣṇam aśúṣam ní Indra.NOM REL.NOM.SG Śuṣṇa.ACC.SG insatiable.ACC.SG down ávṛṇak] ...
wretch.IMPF.3SG

"Indra, who wrenched down insatiable Śúsna." (RV 1.101.2c; raised headed)

(9) tvé tát naḥ suvédam usríyam 2SG.LOC DEM.NOM.SG 1PL.DAT.ENCL easy.to.find.NOM.SG.N reddish.NOM.SG vásu [RC yám tvám hinóṣi mártyam] good.NOM.SG REL.ACC.SG 2SG.NOM drive.PRES.2SG mortal.ACC.SG "In you is that ruddy good [=cattle] easy to find for us (and for) the mortal whom you urge on." (RV 8.4.16cd; internally headed)

#### 1.3 Avestan

Dashti (2022) has demonstrated that Avestan has type 1 and 2:

- (10) yazamaidē ahurəm mazdam $_i$  [RC ȳə gam=cā praise.PRES.1PL Ahura.ACC Mazda.ACC REL.NOM.SG cow.ACC=and aੁsəm=cā dāt] $_i$  truth.ACC=and create.AOR.3SG "We praise the wise Ahura, who created the cow and truth." (Yasna 37.1; OAv. externally headed)
- (11)  $[_{\text{CorCP}} \ y\bar{a} \ v\bar{b} \ vanuhīš \ ahurō \ mazdā \ nāmam \ REL.ACC.PL 2PL.DAT best.VOC.PL Ahura.NOM Mazda.NOM name.ACC.PL \ dadāt]_i \ tāiš_i \ vå \ yazamaidē \ \cdots \ give.INJ.3SG DEM.INS.PL 2PL.ACC praise.PRES.1PL \ "The names which Ahura Mazda, o best ones, gave you, with them we praise you..." (Yasna 38.4; OAv. internally headed)$

### 1.4 Old Persian

Old Persian has types 1 and 3:

- (12) pasāva hauv kāra $_i$  ašiyava [ $_{\rm RC}$  tayam Vahyazdāta thereupon DEM army set.forth.PAST.3SG REL.ACC.SG Vahyazdata.NOM frāišya abiy Vivānam hamaranam cartanay] $_i$  sent.forth.PERF.3SG against Vivana.ACC battle.ACC.SG make.INF "Thereupon the army marched off, which Vahyazdata had sent forth against Vivana to join battle." (DB 3.59-60; externally headed)
- (13)  $[_{CorC}$  kāra Pārsa utā Māda haya upā army.NOM.SG Persian.NOM.SG and Median.NOM.SG REL.NOM.SG with mām āha $]_i$  hauv $_i$  kamnam āha 1SG.ACC COP.PAST.3SG DEM.NOM.SG small.NOM.SG COP.PAST.3SG "The Persian and Median army which was with me, this was a small (force)." (DB 2.18-9; raised headed)

# 2 Izafe Stages

Hale (1989) pointed out that the relationship between the structure of Old Persian relative clauses the izafe-construction must be investigated. Meyer (2015) separated the Iranian izafe development into three stages:

Stage 1: nominal relative clause;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Example (10) and (11) are translated by Dashti (2022).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>All Old Persian translations are from Kent (1989).

Stage 2: nominal relative clause with case attraction;

Stage 3: true izafe with the relative pronoun grammaticalized.

#### 2.1 Vedic

Jamison (2022) examined a similar structure in Vedic, all of the examples of which belong to Stage I. Example (7) is repeated here as example (14):

(14) tám u stușe índram $_i$  [RC yáḥ vídānaḥ] $_i$  DEM.ACC.SG PT praise.1SG Indra.ACC.SG REL.NOM.SG know.MP.NOM.

gírvāhasam gīrbhíḥ yajñávrddham song-vehicled.ACC.SG song.INS.PL sacrifice-strengthed.ACC.SG

"I will praise him - Indra, as he is known - whose vehicle is songs, who is strengthened by sacrifice along with songs" (RV 7.21.2ab; Stage 1)

#### 2.2 Old Avestan

Meyer (2015) showed that examples in both Stage I and Stage II can be found in Old Avestan:

- (15) mat vå padāiš; [RC yā frasrūtā īžaiiå]; with 2PL.ACC footstep.INS.PL REL.NOM.PL famous.NOM.PL Iža.GEN pairijasāi walk-around.SUBJ.1SG

  "with the footsteps, which (are) famous (as those) of Iža, I shall walk around you."

  (Y. 50.8; OAv. Stage 1)
- (16) tāiš šiiao $\vartheta$ anāiš $_i$  [RC yāiš vahištāiš] $_i$  DEM.INS.PL deed.INS.PL REL.INS.PL best.INS.PL "with the best (of) deeds." (Y.35.4; OAv, Stage 2)

## 2.3 Young Avestan

Meyer (2015) also showed that examples of all stages can be found in Young Avestan:

- (17)  $\min_{i} \cdots [_{RC} \ y\bar{o} \ n\bar{o}i\underline{t} \ kahm\bar{a}i \ ai\beta i.draox\delta\bar{o}]_{i}$ Mithra.ACC REL.NOM.SG NEG INDEF.DAT.SG PV.to.be.deceived.NOM.SG "Mithra..., who (is) not to be deceived by anyone." (Yt. 10.17; YAv. Stage 1)
- (18)  $\min \theta r \ni m_i$  [RC yim vouro.gaoiiaotīm]<sub>i</sub> Mithra.ACC.SG REL.ACC.SG wide-pastured.ACC.SG "Mithra with wide pastures." (Yt. 10.1; YAv, Stage 2)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Translation from Jamison's Rigveda translation commentary (2024-1-6)

(19)  $\operatorname{pu}\vartheta \operatorname{rəm}_{i} \quad [\operatorname{Iz} \operatorname{yat} \operatorname{pourušaspahe}]_{i}$   $\operatorname{son.ACC.SG} \quad \operatorname{YAT} \operatorname{Pourušaspa.GEN.SG}$ "the son of Pourušaspa." (Yt. 5.18; YAv, Stage 3)

### 2.4 Old Persian

Meyer (2015) also showed that examples of all stages can be found in Old Persian:

- (20) adam Bardiya<sub>i</sub> amiy [RC haya Kūrauš 1SG.NOM Smerdis.NOM.SG COP.PRES.1SG REL.NOM.SG Cyrus.GEN.SG puça Kabūjiyahyā brātā]<sub>i</sub> son.NOM.SG Cambyses.GEN.SG brother.NOM.SG "I am Smerdis, the son of Cyrus, brother of Cambyses." (DB 1.39; OP, Stage 1)
- (21) adam ... avam Gaumātam $_i$  [RC tayam magum 1SG.NOM DEM.ACC.SG Gaumata.ACC.SG REL.ACC.SG magian.ACC.SG avājanam] $_i$  slay.PAST.1SG "I ... slew that Gaumata, the Magian." (DB 1.56–7; OP, Stage 2)
- (22) ustacanām<sub>i</sub> [<sub>IZ</sub> taya a $\vartheta$ angainām]<sub>i</sub> staircase.ACC.SG TAYA of-stone.ACC.SG "this stone staircase." (A<sup>2</sup>Sc 5-6; OP, Stage 3)

# 3 Analysis

The modern Romance and German type of relative clause differs from the Vedic and Hittite type in two senses: 1. sentential embedding, 2. raised-headedness

The only candidate for embedding in Old Indo-European languages is appositive nominal relative clause, namely izafe Stage 1 (cf. Qu 2023). But izafe Stage 1 can only provide sentential embedding, not raised-headedness, since the head can be in any case but the relative pronoun is always nominative.

(23) tám u stuse índram<sub>i</sub> [RC yáḥ (\*índram<sub>i</sub>)
DEM.ACC.SG PT praise.1SG Indra.ACC.SG REL.NOM.SG
vídānaḥ]<sub>i</sub>
know.MP.NOM.

"I will praise him - Indra, as he is known (RV 7.21.2a)

This explains why Vedic embeddings are always izafe Stage 1.

If a language has izafe stage II, which are *embedded* verbless relative clauses whose head nouns' cases match with the relative clause, but it does not have raised headed (cor)relative clauses, then it is difficult to insert a verb into the izafe stage 2 configuration, since [head rel-pn . . . V] is not a structure for relative clause anywhere in the sentence.

This explains why Avestan does not have verbed embedded relative clauses.

If a language, like Old Persian, has both the izafe stage II structures, which are *embedded* verbless relative clauses whose head nouns' cases match with the relative clause, and also the raised head (cor)relative clauses, which are non-embedded (mostly) verbed (cor)relative clauses whose head nouns precede the relative pronoun, then *embedded postnominal verbed relative clauses* can be developed through a combination the usage of these two aforementioned structures.

[RC kāra Pārsa utā Māda haya upā mām āha] is underlyingly

[ [kāra Pārsa utā Māda]<sub>i</sub> [ $_{RC}$  haya [kāra Pārsa utā Māda]<sub>i</sub> upā mām āha]] thus, an embedded structure like [Gaumātam] [tayam magum] can be reanalyzed as [Gaumātam<sub>i</sub>, [tayam Gaumātam<sub>i</sub> magum]], which is an embedded relative clause.

This provides an explanation for the emergence of Old Persian embedded verbed relative clauses.

(24) iyam dahyāuš  $P\bar{a}rsa_i$ RC taya adam  $d\bar{a}ray\bar{a}miy|_i$ this.NOM.SG country.NOM.SG Persia.NOM REL.ACC.SG 1SG.NOM hold.PRES.1SG uvaspā umartiy $\bar{a}$ <sub>i</sub> baga REL.NOM.SG good-horsed.NOM.SG good-manned.NOM.SG 1SG.GEN god.NOM.SG vazraka Auramazdā frābara great.NOM.SG Ahuramazda.NOM bestow.PAST.3SG "This country Persia which I hold, which is possessed of good horses, of good men, upon me the Great God Ahuramazda bestowed (it)." (AmH 5-7)

	Izafe stage	Raised headedness	Verbed embedded RC
Vedic	I	Yes	No
Old Avestan	II	No	No
Young Avestan	III	No	No
Old Persian	III	Yes	Yes

## 4 Future Work

This case study exemplifies how analogy can apply to a syntactic structure and offers a potential explanation for the emergence of embedded relative clauses in other Indo-European branches. Since embedded relative clauses are attested in other branches such as Greek and Latin:

(25) δαιμόνι' οὐκ ἄν τίς τοι ἀνὴρ $_i$  [ $_{\rm RC}$  δς strange.man.VOC.SG NEG PT IND.NOM.SG 2SG.DAT man.NOM.SG REL.NOM.SG ἐναίσιμος εἴη] $_i$  | right-minded.NOM.SG COP.PRES.OPT.3SG

ἔργον ἀτιμήσειε μάχης, ... work.ACC.SG dishonor.AOR.OPT.3SG battle.GEN.SG

"Strange man, no one who is right-minded would make light of your work in battle." (Z.521-2)

(26) Agedum istum $_i$  ostende [RC quem conscripsti] $_i$  come.on that.ACC.SG show.PRES.IMP.2SG REL.ACC.SG compose.PERF.2SG syngraphum $_i$  contract.ACC.SG

"Come on, show that contract which you wrote." (Plautus As. 746)

The relationship between verbed relative clauses and izafe-like structures in these branches may show how embedded relative clauses developed in these branches, if embedded relative clauses were innovated in these branches.

## References

Brame, M. 1968, A new analysis of the relative clause: Evidence for an interpretive theory, unpublished manuscript, MIT.

Dashti, S. 2022. The Old Avestan correlatives: An alternative LFG analysis. In *Proceedings* of the Lexical Functional Grammar Conference (pp. 104-123).

Davison, A. 2009. Adjunction, features and locality in Sanskrit and Hindi/Urdu correlatives. Lipták, 223-62.

Hale, M. 1988. Old Persian word order. *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 31(1), 27-40.

Hettrich, H. 1988 Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hock, H. 1989. Conjoined we stand: Theoretical implications of Sanskrit relative structures. Studies in the Linguistics Sciences 19.1, 93-126.

Hock, H. 2015. Proto-Indo-European verb-finality: Reconstruction, typology, validation. In *Proto-Indo-European syntax and its development*. 51-78. John Benjamins.

Jamison, S. & Brereton, J. 2014. The Rig Veda, the earliest religious poetry of India, Oxford University Press.

Jamison, S. 2022. Stray remarks on nominal relative clauses in Vedic and Old Iranian: Protoproto- izafe. *Ha! Linguistic Studies in honor of Mark R. Hale*, ed. Laura Grestenberger, Charles Reiss, Hannes A. Fellner and Gabriel Z. Pantillon, 171-182. Beech Stave.

Kent, R. 1989. Old Persian: Grammar, texts, lexicon (Vol. 33). American Oriental Society. Meyer, R. 2015. Case attraction and NP-linking in Old Iranian. Presented at 6th International Conference on Iranian Linguistics Tbilisi, July 23-26, 2015.

Motter, T. 2023. Clausal relations at the interfaces: A study of Hittite correlatives at the intersection of syntax, semantics, and discourse. University of California, Los Angeles.

Probert, P. 2006 Clause boundaries in Old Hittite relative sentences. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 104:1, 17-83.

Qu, Y. 2021. Vedic correlative constructions. Presented at East Coast Indo-European Conference XL (ECIEC XL), Virginia Tech/Cornell University, June 17-19, 2021.

Qu, Y 2023. "Prezafe": Precursor of izafe and its descendants in other IE branches. Presented at East Coast Indo-European Conference XLII (ECIEC XLII), Carrboro, NC, June 23-25, 2023.

Ram-Prasad, K. 2022. The syntax of relative clauses and related phenomena in Proto-Indo-European. University of Cambridge, Cambridge.

Schachter, P. 1973. Focus and relativization. Language 49(1), 19-46