

# *Some reflections on the Gothic optative*

by Lucio Melazzo\*

## *1. Preamble*

Admittedly, the verbal systems of the earliest Indo-European (henceforth IE) languages are not so congruous with one another as the nominal paradigms. The reconstruction of IE is conformably fraught with far greater difficulty, and there is plenty of room for doubt. Indeed, disagreement exists even as to which verbal categories should be posited for IE, let alone the manners in which these categories were manifested in the verbal morphology.

Clackson (2007, 114 f.) has recently emphasized an important difference between the methodology of verbal and nominal reconstruction. When two dissimilar markers are utilized as a sign of the same category of the noun, an attempt can normally be made to account for the dissimilarity with recourse to phonetic changes. So, for instance, final *\*-s* is employed as a sign of the nominative singular in most non-neuter declension classes in IE, but *r*-stem *\*ph<sub>2</sub>ter-* has a nominative singular ending *\*-ēr*, without *\*-s*. Nevertheless, when assuming that the category of nominative was initially the same in the *r*-stem declension as in the other athematic declensions, the allomorphy could be spelt out by hypothesizing a change *\*-ers* > *\*-ēr* in prehistory. This reconstruction of a sole marker for the nominative singular is grounded on the premise that the nominal categories of case which are found in the earliest IE languages are unaltered in IE. On the other hand, when attempts are made at the reconstruction of the verb, there is a general tendency for scholars to regard reconstructed categories with less assuredness and pay more heed to reconstructed markers. So,

\* Università degli Studi di Palermo.

for example, when considering the verbal marker *\*-r* used 1) in some languages to mark middle voice forms, and 2) to mark the third person plural in the perfect paradigm, scholars have generally acknowledged that the *\*-r* marker of the third plural is unrelated to its allomorph *\*-nt*, which marks the third person plural in other paradigms, but a theory has suggested that it was originally employed as a third person and from there was associated with an impersonal meaning, which was later extended to middle forms (see Jasanoff, 1977). Albeit extreme, this is an example of the inclination to attach more weight to markers than categories, but it does mirror a presumptive ‘fluidity’ of verbal categories: they run into one another, and markers may be transmitted readily from one category to another. This is why the actual reconstructed morphs are viewed as the soundest foundations on which the reconstruction can rest.

In this paper a particular morph will be dealt with, which does not go back as such to IE. The proto-language must have possessed the linguistic unit employed in Gothic to form the verbal endings that are to be discussed here. Traces of this unit are found in other IE languages, as a matter of fact, and Gothic has utilized it in its own way. The issue will be discussed inside what is called the Greco-Aryan model. Indeed, based chiefly on Greek and Sanskrit, this model has put a valid interpretation on the derivation of the verbal systems of Latin, Baltic, Slavic, Germanic, Armenian, and Celtic, even if it does not work well as an explanation for the Anatolian languages (see Clackson, 2007, 114 ff.). Thus, the reconstruction undertaken here will be put forward as if the Anatolian languages did not exist.

## 2. *The optative in the active from IE to Gothic*

In all likelihood, both in Gothic and the other old Germanic languages the system of the optative dates back to the IE optative<sup>1</sup>.

The IE suffix of the optative underwent systematic vowel alternation exhibiting *ē*-grade in stressed syllables (*\*-yē-* < *\*-yeh<sub>1</sub>-*) and zero-grade (*\*-ī-* < *\*-ih<sub>1</sub>-* < *\*-yh<sub>1</sub>-*) in unstressed syllables. This is clearly shown in table 1 containing the athematic optative of the IE verb ‘to be’.

<sup>1</sup> The terminology differs for this set of forms with separate present and preterite paradigms. Some scholars prefer subjunctive (recently also Harbert, 2007, 278 ff.), but formally it corresponds to the IE optative. Since it conflates the functions of the IE subjunctive and optative, either term can be used. This work uses the latter.

TABLE 1

The athematic optative of the IE verb ‘to be’ and its derivatives in some daughter languages

IE	Sanskrit	Greek	Early Latin
* <i>b<sub>1</sub>s-yébh<sub>1</sub>-m</i>	<i>syám</i>	εἶην	<i>siēm</i>
* <i>b<sub>1</sub>s-yébh<sub>1</sub>-s</i>	<i>syās</i>	εἶης	<i>siēs</i>
* <i>b<sub>1</sub>s-yébh<sub>1</sub>-t</i>	<i>syāt</i>	εἶη	<i>siēd</i>
* <i>b<sub>1</sub>s-ybh<sub>1</sub>-mé</i>	<i>syāma</i>	εἶμεν	<i>sīmus</i>
* <i>b<sub>1</sub>s-ybh<sub>1</sub>-té</i>	<i>syāta</i>	εἶτε	<i>sītis</i>
* <i>b<sub>1</sub>s-ybh<sub>1</sub>-ént</i>	<i>syúr/syātana</i>	εἶεν	<i>sient</i>
	<i>syātam</i>	εἶτον	
	<i>syātām</i>	εἶτην	

Optative is regarded as a late development in IE in light of three prime considerations. Firstly, the endings of this mood are not distinguished from indicative, and they are thought to originate from the set of the so-called ‘secondary’ endings<sup>2</sup>. Secondly, there are IE languages in which the optative is given form directly from the verbal root without any particular tense-aspect stem. This is what is also found in Tocharian (see Pinault, 1989, 124 f.), to a considerable degree, in the Sanskrit of the hymns of the *R̥g Veda*, optatives formed to verbal roots exceed those presenting derived stems. This may well be taken to imply that the types of forms which were to grow into optatives were formerly found beside other derived stems without being made from derived stems. Expressed in a different way, these types of forms – once qualified as distinct, derived stems – were subsequently grammaticalized as markers of mood and included into the verbal paradigm. Thirdly, the hypothesis just put forward receives confirmation from certain particular aspects of the formation of the mood in the IE languages. In the daughter languages the optative is formed with athematic stems differently than with thematic. As to athematic stems, the ablauting

<sup>2</sup> Preceded by the three singular and the three plural persons, the last two forms set out below in the columns of Sanskrit and Greek are the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> persons dual of the optative formed from the root *as* and the optative of εἶμι respectively. No corresponding forms are testified to either in Early Latin or in Gothic. The optative forms of the former are drawn up in the column furthest to the right in table 1. Those of the latter can be seen below in table 5 in the text. This is the reason why the IE original forms have not been reconstructed. Anyway, the endings Skt *-tam* and *-tām* are perfectly equivalent to Gr. *-τον* and *-την*.

suffix  $*-yeh_1-$ / $*-ih_1-$  is reconstructed and it was mentioned above in this section and shown in table 1. With regard to thematic stems, on the other hand, an optative suffix  $*-oi-$  can be reconstructed which did not ablaut.

Gothic has had a crucial role in the reconstruction of this suffix by reason of its correspondence with Indo-Iranian and Greek, which is clearly revealed by the following set of forms in table 2.

TABLE 2

Forms of both the mother and some daughter languages with an optative suffix  $*-oi-$

IE	Sanskrit	Greek	Gothic
$*bher-oi-t$ “s/he might carry”	<i>bhāret</i>	φέρου	<i>bairai</i>
$*bher-oi-me$ “we might carry”	<i>bhārema</i>	φέρομεν	<i>bairaima</i>

Gothic continues  $*-oi-$  in the present optative both active and passive as well as in the preterite optative active, and this unit results from the thematic vowel  $*-o-$  joining with  $*-ī-$  ( $< *-ih_1-$ ), the zero-grade of the suffix of the optative. This  $*-oi-$  may be accounted for by turning to the four-part analogical process described here below in table 3.

TABLE 3

The analogical process accounting for  $*-oi-$

$$*h_1s-mé (> *s-mé) : *h_1s-ih_1-mé (> *sī-mé) :: *bhéro-me : x \\ x = *bhéroih_1-me (> *bhéroī-me).$$

At an earlier stage of the parent language the relationship between the athematic indicative  $*h_1s-mé$  (or  $*s-mé$ ) “we are” and the athematic optative  $*h_1s-ih_1-mé$  (or  $*sī-mé$ ) “we might be” was made equivalent to the thematic indicative  $*bhéro-me$  “we carry” and the thematic optative  $*bhéroih_1-me$  (or  $*bhéroī-me$ ) “we might carry” by inserting  $*-ih_1-$  (or  $*-ī-$ ) before the ending  $*-me$ . Precisely this morph marked the difference between indicative and optative forms in the athematic conjugation. Then,  $*bhéroī-me$  passed to  $*bhéroi-me$ . If no fault is found with this reasoning, the hypothesis that the optative started

developing as a grammatical mood much later in the prehistory of IE is corroborated, inasmuch as separate forms for thematic and athematic paradigms were produced.

Like the other Germanic languages, Gothic adopted *\*-i-* (<*\*-ī-*) as the sole morph of the optative.

TABLE 4

*\*-i-* (<*\*-ī-*) as the sole morph of the Gothic optative

Present optative active of <i>bairan</i> "to bear"	Preterite optative active of <i>biudan</i> "to offer"
<i>bairau</i> (< <i>*beraju</i> < <i>*bhér-o-yh<sub>1</sub>-m</i> )	<i>budjau</i> (← <i>*bud-jēn</i> < <i>*(bhe-)bhudh-yē-m</i> )
<i>bairais</i> (< <i>*beraiz</i> < <i>*bhér-o-ī-s</i> )	<i>budeis</i> (← <i>*bud-jēz</i> < <i>*(bhe-)bhudh-yē-s</i> )
<i>bairai</i> (< <i>*berai</i> < <i>*bhér-o-ī-t</i> )	<i>budi</i> (← <i>*bud-jē</i> < <i>*(bhe-)bhudh-yē-t</i> )
<i>bairaim-a</i> (< <i>*beraime</i> < <i>*bhér-o-ī-me</i> )	<i>budeima</i> (← <i>*bud-ī-me</i> < <i>*(bhe-)bhudh-ī-me</i> )
<i>bairaiþ</i> (< <i>*beraide</i> < <i>*bhér-o-ī-te</i> )	<i>budeiþ</i> (← <i>*bud-ī-de</i> < <i>*(bhe-)bhudh-ī-te</i> )
<i>bairain-a</i> (< <i>*bera(j)in</i> < <i>*bhér-o-yh<sub>1</sub>-ent</i> )	<i>budeina</i> (← <i>*bud-j-in</i> < <i>*(bhe-)bhudh-yh<sub>1</sub>-ent</i> )
<i>bairaiw-a</i> (< <i>*beraiwe</i> < <i>*bhér-o-ī-we</i> )	<i>budeiwa</i> (← <i>*bur-ī-we</i> < <i>*(bhe-)bhudh-ī-we</i> )
<i>bairaits</i> (< <i>*beraid-</i> < <i>*bhér-o-ī-t-</i> )	<i>budeits</i> (← <i>*bur-ī-d-</i> < <i>*(bhe-)bhudh-ī-t-</i> )

On account of the comparatively small quantity of Gothic which has come down to us, there is not a single verb with all the forms of its paradigm occurring in the corpus of texts of this language. Of most verbs, in fact, very few forms appear; of many, only one or two. The forms missing in the set of those constituting the paradigms of the present optative active of the fourth class strong verb *bairan*, and of the preterite optative active of the second class strong verb *biudan* have been provided by following the pattern of appropriate extant forms belonging to other verbs<sup>3</sup>. On the other hand, the Germanic and the IE reconstructed forms written in brackets in this order to the right of the Gothic are morphologically hypothetical, and it cannot be presumed that all the given forms existed in the parent language<sup>4</sup>. Set

<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the first person dual of the preterite optative does not occur at all, either in strong or in weak verbs. Its termination *-eiwa*, however, may be assumed to have been analogous to that of the corresponding person of the present tense, i.e. *-aiwa*.

<sup>4</sup> Also, there are no reasonable grounds for supposing that the preterite-presents have ever had an optative formed like *\*(bhe-)bhudh-yē-*.

out in columns, the Gothic forms are quoted in this order: firstly, the three persons of the singular; secondly, the three persons of the plural; thirdly, the first and the second person of the dual. In Gothic, in fact, the dual only occurs in the first and second person.

Most of the terminations of both the present and the preterite optative active are clear enough and have been discussed in detail in the available literature (see, among others, Wright, 1968<sup>2</sup>; Krause, 1968; Bammesberger, 1986). As to the ends of the present optative active, that of the first person singular has created difficulties for scholars, given that in old Germanic languages two diverse, incompatible forms are found: Go. *-au* corresponds to ON *-a<sup>5</sup>*, but the West Germanic languages go back to *\*-ai<sup>6</sup>*. Since in the thematic optative Germ. *\*-ai-* (< IE *\*-oi-*) appears before the secondary endings (2<sup>nd</sup> sg. Germ. *\*-ai<sup>z</sup>* < IE *\*-oi-s*; 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. Germ. *\*-ai* < IE *\*-oi-t* etc), West Germanic might testify to an original form IE *\*-oi-m* > Germ. *\*-ai*. This is not the earliest form that has been reconstructed in table 3. Indeed, not only does the termination *\*-oyh<sub>1</sub>m*, given above, account for Go. *-au* satisfactorily, but it can also be confirmed by the Arcadian optative form ἐξελάνοια with *-α* < *\*-ŋ* (cf. Schwyzer, 1959<sup>3</sup>, I, 25 and *passim*; Krause, 1968, 226)<sup>7</sup>. As to West Germanic, 1<sup>st</sup> sg. *\*-ai<sup>n</sup>* might have been rebuilt analogically, when the relationship between 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. *\*-ī-z* and 1<sup>st</sup> sg. *\*-īn* in the athematic optative was made equivalent to 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. *\*-ai-z* and 1<sup>st</sup> sg. *\*-ai* in the thematic optative. The end IE *\*-oyh<sub>1</sub>-ent* of the third plural form would be expected to have passed to Germ. *\*-ajin* > *\*-ain*. Then in Go. *-aina* a particle *-a* was added of uncertain origin. The same holds true for both *-aima* of the first plural form and *-aiwa* of the first dual<sup>8</sup>. In the second dual ending the unvoiced dental of IE *\*-tHes/-tom* (> Skt *-thas/-tam*, Gr. *-/-tov*) could only remain unchanged in athematic paradigms after stems ending in either *-s-* or a non-dental stop. Evidently Go. *-ts* spread from this type of paradigms into the others.

When table 3 is carefully observed, a difference is very obvious to everybody. The Gothic forms of the present optative active directly derive from the Germanic and the Germanic from the IE. This is not the case for the Gothic forms of the preterite optative active. The

<sup>5</sup> So, as an example, ON *bera* is the equivalence of Go. *bairau*.

<sup>6</sup> Here, previously in table 3, and later on the exponent *n* indicates the nasalization of the preceding vowel.

<sup>7</sup> Osthoff (1881, 302) was the first to get the *-u* from a sonant *-ŋ*.

<sup>8</sup> With relation to *-aiwa*, an original form *\*-oywē* < *\*-o-yh<sub>1</sub>-wē* has also been surmised (cf. Krause, 1968, 261).

Germanic are supposed to stem from the IE, but the Gothic do not have the Germanic as their immediate origin. This is clearly shown by the arrow ‘←’ between the Gothic and the Germanic forms, whereas a direct derivation is denoted by ‘<’ in both the sections of the table.

Gothic has therefore innovated so profoundly with reference to the optative that the outward appearance of the paradigm of this mood is quite different from the parent language and not simply due to a phonological change.

Innovation can also be noticed in the athematic optative of the verb ‘to be’ displayed in table 5.

---

TABLE 5  
The Gothic athematic optative of the verb ‘to be’

---

<i>sijau</i>	←	* <i>sjēn</i>
<i>sijais</i>	←	* <i>sjēz</i>
<i>sijai</i>	←	* <i>sjē</i>
<i>sijaima</i>	←	* <i>sīme</i>
<i>sijaiþ</i>	←	* <i>sīde</i>
<i>sijaina</i>	←	* <i>sjin</i>

---

To the right, in table 5, the Germanic forms have been reconstructed. The three persons in the singular are listed first; the three persons in the plural come next. No dual person form is attested in Gothic. The Germanic forms are assumed to issue from the IE given in table 1. The Gothic forms, on the other hand, do not have the Germanic as their immediate source. The outcome of the 1<sup>st</sup> sg. Germ. \**sjēn* would have been \**sī* (< \**s-ī-n*), once the nasalization of *-ī* had disappeared. This form, however, took on the termination *-au* of the thematic optative (\**sī* + *au* → *sijau*) and triggered off the integral assumption of the thematic optative paradigm.

### 3. The Gothic optative passive

As is common knowledge, Gothic is the only Germanic language to exhibit a ‘synthetic’ passive<sup>9</sup>. The origin of the passive conjugation in

<sup>9</sup> In the preterite the Gothic optative displays a periphrastic formation.

Gothic can clearly be traced back to the IE middle, but Gothic has given up all the middle values but the passive. The paradigms of both the present indicative and the present optative passive with regard to *niman* “to take” are shown in table 6.

TABLE 6

The Gothic present indicative and optative in the passive

Present indicative passive	Present optative passive
<i>nimada</i> (← <i>*nim-ai</i> < <i>*nem-e-h<sub>2</sub>-i</i> )	<i>nimaidau</i> (← <i>*nem-ai-</i> < <i>*nem-oi-</i> )
<i>nimaza</i> (← <i>*nim-i-zai</i> < <i>*nem-e-so-i</i> )	<i>nimaizau</i> (← <i>*nem-ai-za</i> < <i>*nem-oi-so</i> )
<i>nimada</i> (← <i>*nim-i-dai</i> < <i>*nem-e-to-i</i> )	<i>nimaidau</i> (← <i>*nem-ai-da</i> < <i>*nem-oi-to</i> )
<i>nimanda</i> (< <i>*nemandai</i> < <i>*nem-o-nto-i</i> )	<i>nimaindau</i> (← <i>*nem-ai-nda</i> < <i>*nem-oi-nto</i> )

As strikes everybody’s eye, in both paradigms the 1<sup>st</sup> and the 2<sup>nd</sup> pl. persons have been replaced by the 3<sup>rd</sup>, which is the sole extant form for the three plural persons. Moreover, there is not the slightest trace of dual forms. Also, the reconstruction of the IE source of the Gothic 1<sup>st</sup> sg. form of the present indicative passive is highly problematic, because diverse, significant innovation has occurred in the daughter languages. Some circumstantial evidence suggests that, in the set of IE middle forms, the 1<sup>st</sup> sg. marker could have been IE *\*-h<sub>2</sub>*<sup>10</sup>. However things stand, a discussion about the original 1<sup>st</sup> sg. middle form in the parent language can end here, for in Gothic the pres. pass. 1<sup>st</sup> sg. form was remodeled after the 3<sup>rd</sup>. The 2<sup>nd</sup> sg., the 3<sup>rd</sup> sg., and the 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. endings can originate from IE *\*-so(i)*, *\*-to(i)*, and *\*-nto(i)* respectively with the same *\*-i* as in the active endings originally marking “here and now”. Besides, Germ. *\*nimizai* parallels Skt *bharase* and Gr. (Hom.) φέρεαι (< *\*φέρεσαι*), Germ. *\*nimidai* is similar to Skt *bharate* and Gr. φέρεται, Germ. *\*nemandai* is comparable to Skt *bharante* and Gr. φέρονται. Precisely the 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. Go. *nimanda* goes directly back to Germ. *\*nemandai*, and its medial *-a-* was leveled out into the other two forms, whence *nimaza*, *nimada*, *nimanda*.

The optative passive has the morph *-ai-* representative of the thematic optative mood, and the same endings as the indicative

<sup>10</sup> For further up-to-date information on the *status quaestionis* concerning the IE middle, see Clackson (2007, 142-51).



passive with an added *-u*<sup>11</sup>. This *-u*, which makes all the four forms of the optative passive end in *-au*, qualifies as a result of Gothic innovation.

Scholars have attempted to explain this termination of the optative passive. They have followed three different paths. Some of them have hypothesized an influence from the 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. and the 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. forms of the imperative and/or from the 1<sup>st</sup> sg. forms of the optative active in the present as well as in the preterite, which all end in *-au* too (see Krause 1968, 262)<sup>12</sup>. Some others have concentrated on the sole *-u* and identified it with a deictic particle added especially to verbal and pronominal forms to emphasize them (see Wright, 1968<sup>2</sup>, 140). Others have simply spoken of a particle *-u* without any more specification for the need for caution (see Bammesberger, 1986, 94). All three attempts leave the question of the derivation of *-u* open, however. With relation to the first, imagining that *-u* might have been assumed from verbal formations that owned it properly would be a plausible idea provided an explanation of why the analogical process was triggered was given. This explanation still has not been given by any scholar, however. With reference to the second, recognizing *-u* as an emphasizing, deictic particle requires clarification of the value that was attached to it when it was added to the pre-existing endings. With respect to the third, only mentioning a particle without trying to know anything more about it means surrendering unconditionally to the difficulties presented by the issue.

As to the third of the three attempts at an explanation of *-u* in the paradigm of the present optative passive, suffice it to say that caution can sometimes prevent knowledge from advancing.

The first attempt, on the other hand, appears much feeble, inasmuch as it is quite difficult to conceive how and why the forms of this paradigm should have taken on this termination. It has been said earlier back in section 1. that the pret. opt. act. 1<sup>st</sup> sg. was altered in imitation of the pres. opt. act. 1<sup>st</sup> sg., and this can be illustrated by the four-part analogy in table 7.

<sup>11</sup> Of course, the opt. pass. 1<sup>st</sup> sg., too, was rebuilt by analogy to the 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. by virtue of the same process observed above in the text with reference to the present indicative passive.

<sup>12</sup> Beekes (2011) has recently imagined that *-au* in the present optative passive was only effected by *-au* in the 1<sup>st</sup> sg. present and preterite optative.

TABLE 7

The analogical process accounting for *-au* as the ending of the pret. opt. act. 1<sup>st</sup> sg. form

$$biuda-is \text{ (2<sup>nd</sup> sg.)} : biud-au \text{ (1<sup>st</sup> sg.)} :: bude-is \text{ (< *budi-(j)is; 2<sup>nd</sup> sg.)} : x \text{ (1<sup>st</sup> sg.)} \\ x = budjau$$

So as to explain, by way of illustration, a pres. opt. pass. 1<sup>st</sup> sg. form like *nimaidau* by analogy to the pres. opt. act. 1<sup>st</sup> sg. *nimau* corresponding to *bairau* in table 4 and *biud-au* in table 7, a proportion identical to that in table 7 is not easy to imagine – unless it would be better to say straight out that it cannot be devised. There is no one termination of the forms of the present optative active that could be compared to one of those of the present optative passive, of which three end in *-dau* and one in *-zau*. Of course, it could be theorized that, despite the category of voice, *-au* might have spread further as an ending of the 1<sup>st</sup> sg. in the optative mood, once the pret. opt. act. 1<sup>st</sup> sg. had also assumed it. This might tentatively be disclosed by the four-part analogy in table 8.

TABLE 8

The analogical process accounting for *-au* as the ending of the pres. opt. pass. 1<sup>st</sup> sg. form

$$bair-a \text{ (pres. ind. act. 1<sup>st</sup> sg.)} : bair-au \text{ (pres. opt. act. 1<sup>st</sup> sg.)} :: bairad-a \text{ (pres. ind.} \\ \text{pass. 1<sup>st</sup> sg.)} : x \text{ (pres. opt. pass. 1<sup>st</sup> sg.)} \\ x = bairaidau$$

But why ever should the present optative passive have borrowed *-au* as its one and only termination? Neither is the recourse to the 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. and the 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. forms of the imperative, when taken as models into which the forms of the present optative might have been leveled out, ultimately decisive. As an example, the imp. 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. Go. *bairandau*, definitely matches Gr. Doric φερόντω “let them bear” and, when compared with this, reveals the same final *-u* as the imp. 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. Skt *bharant-u*, endowed with the same meaning, exhibits. On the other hand, the imp. 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. Go. *bairadau* can be related to Gr. φερέτω and compared with Skt *bharat-u*, both meaning “let him bear”. Differently from the Greek form the Gothic has the thematic vowel *-a-* (< \**-o-*) instead of *-i-* (< \**-e-*) from the 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. and like the Sanskrit presents final *-u*.

If the above remarks are on the right track, then it only remains to be seen whether a sufficiently precise value can be attached to *-u* made out as an enclitic particle joined to complete the passive forms of the optative. A few residual forms with this *-u* are found in certain IE languages. In Greek, for example, πάν-υ “altogether, at all” is mentioned beside neut. πᾶν “all”, while the demonstrative οὗτος αὕτη τοῦτο “this” is said to have arisen from a reduplication of the demonstrative ὁ ἡ τό with insertion of υ, e.g. τοῦτο < \*το[δ] υ το[δ] (see Schwyzler, 1959<sup>3</sup>, I, 611)<sup>13</sup>. Moreover, while αὐ- of αὕτη may well derive from \*seh<sub>2</sub> u-, οὐ- (< \*so u-) of οὗτος can be compared, as an example, with Skt. so (< \*sa u) cit “even he, even that” and a-sa-u “that there” (see Wackernagel, 1957, 339; 1930, 529, 541). In all likelihood it is the same *-u* that occurs in Gothic as an interrogative particle, as *skuld-u ist?* “is it lawful?”; *ga-u-laubjats?* “do you two believe?”; *sa-u ist sa sunus izwar?* “is this your son?”.

As is common knowledge, the optative mood is used in Gothic to express wishes, desires as well as situations that are not regarded as, or known to be, real by the speaker. It is also employed as a conditional mood and in reported speech. It is therefore utilized in both dependent, i.e. subordinate, and independent, i.e. matrix, clauses.

When subordinate clauses are considered, volitional complements are to be mentioned. They are unrealized, i.e. inherently unreal, and their time frame is at least partly dependent on the matrix time frame (Mk 15.12). Verbs of asking class do not allow a full range of tenses in the subordinate clause independent of those in the matrix clause, and also take the optative (Lk 8.32). Although verbs of thinking are epistemic, there are situations in which an optative is used. This is the case when the complement is unrealized or potential (Mt 6.7), and the topic of discussion is in doubt (Jn 13.22). In fact, any epistemic verb can have its complement clause verb in the optative when unrealized or potential (Jn 12.34). As stated by Harbert (2007, 279), the choice between indicative and optative involves the «degree of potentiality for the proposition to be(come) true». Complements of certain adjectives set up a potential situation or eventuality which entails a shift to the optative (Jn 16.7). A negated clause matrix verb alters the implication and, according to Mossé (1956<sup>2</sup>, 195), brings up a question as to the actuality of the realization – hence the optative (Mt 5.17; Lk 9.58 and

<sup>13</sup> A reduplication of the article without insertion of *-u*- seems recognizable in a form *τοτο* written on a vase of Dipylon (see Schwyzler, 1959<sup>3</sup>, I, 611 and Chantraine, 1968, 841).

15.19). A purposive is inherently unrealized and therefore motivates the optative when the subject of the matrix differs from that of the subordinate clause (2 Thess. 3.14).

Independent functions of the optative include deontic or agent-oriented modalities (obligation etc.), illocution operators of reinforcing mode (imperative, admonitive), proposition operators of subjective mode, including doubt or uncertainty, conditionality, possibility or potentiality, and boulomaic modalities, i.e. wishing (volitive or desiderative) and hoping (optative or hortative). So-called fulfillable wishes are expressed with the present optative. Those less likely of fulfillment are expressed with preterit optative. While examples can be found that belong to the category of true optatives (Mt 6. 9-10; 2 Cor. 10.7; Lk 9.23), to the category of reinforcing mode belong imperative substitutes, which are more polite or less abrupt than imperatives (Mt 7.13). Mossé (1956<sup>2</sup>, 194) has given examples belonging to the category of potentiality or eventuality (Mk 4.9; Jn 16.18). It is potentiality, however, that is a major function of the Gothic optative (Mt 6.12 and 7.12).

It is now worth considering how the unreal value of the optative mood might have affected the Gothic form of the present passive in this mood. When grammatical voice is viewed as a system for moving arguments representing non-agential thematic relations into subject position, the passive can be seen essentially as a process for moving thematic arguments in and out of sentential subject position. In other words, passive characterizes a class of sentences in which the thematic role borne by the subject does not correspond to the Agent prototype. In languages like Gothic a formal alternation in verbal morphology indicates which of the two statuses (Agent or Undergoer) is borne by the sentential subject. The passive voice in the optative implicates that an affected entity may undergo action but is not obliged to do so also because of the basic unreal value of the mood. This is why the final *-u* was added to the endings and became an essential part of them, its role being that of pointing out and stressing an action over which the subject as an Undergoer could have no influence. A similar function might have been fulfilled by *-u* in the 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. and 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. of the imperative. An order given or a prohibition noticed indirectly, whether through an intermediary or not, may definitely need to be emphasized, as a matter of fact. So not only might Gothic have shared the choice of utilizing *\*-u* in the 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. and 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. forms of the imperative with Sanskrit, as has been hinted at above, but, when *beret-ū* “s/he bears” and *berqt-ū* “they bear” are taken into account, another daughter language, Old

Church Slavic, might also have employed it in the 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. and 3<sup>rd</sup> pl. forms of the indicative by taking them as non-persons in Benveniste's style and feeling therefore the need to point them out in a special way.

### *References*

- Bammesberger A. (1986), *Der Aufbau des germanischen Verbalsystems*, Carl Winter Universitäts-Verlag, Heidelberg.
- Beekes R. S. P. (2011), *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam-Philadelphia.
- Benveniste É. (1946), *Structure des relations de personne dans le verbe*, in "Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique", 43, fasc. 1, 126, pp. 1-12 (repr. in Id., *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, Éditions Gallimard, Paris 1966, vol. 1, pp. 225-36).
- Chantraine P. (1968), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*, fasc. 1, Éditions Klincksieck, Paris.
- Clackson J. (2007), *Indo-European Linguistics. An Introduction*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Harbert W. (2007), *The Germanic Languages*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Jasanoff J. H. (1977), *The r-endings of the IE Middle*, in "Die Sprache", 23, pp. 159-70.
- Krause W. (1968), *Handbuch des Gotischen*, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, München.
- Meier-Brügger M. (2003), *Indo-European Linguistics*, de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Mossé F. (1956<sup>2</sup>), *Manuel de la langue gotique, grammaire, textes, glossaire*, Aubier, Paris.
- Osthoff H. (1881), *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen*, iv Teil, Verlag von S. Hirzel, Leipzig.
- Pinault G.-J. (1989), *Introduction au tokharien*, in "Lalies. Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature", 7, pp. 1-224.
- Rauch I. (2003), *The Gothic Language: Grammar, Genetic Provenance and Typology, Readings*, Peter Lang, New York.
- Schwyzler E. (1959<sup>3</sup>), *Griechische Grammatik*, 1. Band, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, München.
- Wackernagel J. (1930), *Altindische Grammatik*, 3. Band, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.
- Id. (1957), *Altindische Grammatik*, 1. Band, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.
- Wright J. (1968<sup>2</sup>), *Grammar of the Gothic Language*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

