Abstract. Yiddish narratives contain a considerable number of declarative sentences which begin with the inflected verb: *Hot im zayn vayb bald tsurikgeshikt dem briv* 'So his wife right away returned the letter.' Such declarative sentences, which are never initial in a text, are often said to have resultative meaning (note the translation of the example just given); however grammarians concede that one encounters them often without such a meaning. The purpose of this study is to try to establish the discourse function of these V/I clauses, utilizing the framework of Prince (1988). It turns out that the occurrence of the finite verb in initial position is a marker of cohesion, and that V/I clauses actually contrast, in their ties to previous material, with non-V/I clauses.

My study as a by-product supports the conclusions of Prince (1988) regarding other clauses in Yiddish in which the verb does not immediately follow the subject. I also include remarks on V/I constructions in German (§4.0).

This paper supersedes the earlier version in KWPL 14:1(1989). Thanks to Bill Keel and Tom Shannon for comments and encouragement, and to Moshe Taube for his help with the provenance of my texts. I owe special thanks to Ellen Prince for a detailed critique of an earlier version; I alone am responsible for any errors.

This paper was made possible by a 1988-89 sabbatical leave granted me by the University of Kansas.

Spelling of the romanized Yiddish examples has been normalized to the YIVO system.
1.0 Introduction. Despite a few OV characteristics (Hall 1979; den Besten & Moed-van Walraven 1986), Yiddish is effectively described as an SVO language with a verb-second rule (which in Yiddish has been extended to clauses with overt complementizers). We find verb-initial constructions not untypical of Germanic languages; e.g., imperatives and hortatives:

(1) Gev freg im aleyn.
'Go ask him himself.'

(2) Zol di dozike simkhe shoyn zayn a gantse.
'May our present joy be complete.'

We find the occasional pro-drop declarative with conventionally understood subject, thus verb-initial:

(3) Hob nisht gevust; ikh bet dir...
'[I] didn't know; I beg you...'

Finally there is the expected array of sentences with preposed initial clauses:

(4) Ven Dovid hot dos gezien, hot er gezogt...
'When David saw this, he said...'

However there are also a number of types of declarative clause\(^2\) with subject present and without a preceding fronted clause, which have the form (ES) - Verb - X - Subject - Y (where ES is the expletive es, as in Es iz genumen geyn a regn 'It began to rain.'). One of these types--the focus of this paper--is the so-called consecutive clause, which does not have ES: Hot im zayn vayb bald tsurikgeshikt dem briv '(So) his wife right away returned the letter.' (See §3 for background on this type.)

1.1 Clause types. In order to describe all the possible clause types, including the unmarked Subject-Verb-Object order, I will use the same theory-neutral system as Prince (1988): the three parameters for classification of clauses are (a) the position of the verb (clause-initial position or V/I, clause-second or V/2, (b) position of the subject (Initial field, Middle field, Final field), and (c) whether or not there is an expletive ES. Initial field is simply

\(^2\) In this paper "clause" means S, that is, a structural sentence whether functioning as an initial clause or not.
clause-initial position; Middle field is the position following the finite verb (optionally separated from the verb however by the reflexive zikh, object pronouns, discourse particles, and/or PPs with pronominal NPs. Final field is the position at the end of the VP (optionally followed by extraposed PPs and Ss). I will call subjects in Final field "postposed subjects." These parameters give seven types of clause, exemplified below. (The numbers after the examples are coding for the source texts; see below, §3.2.)

I. V/1

A. Middle subject

(5) Zenen di khakhomim im nokhgegangen fun untn
   'The sages followed him from below' (6a)

(6) Hobn zey im geentfert: "Mir veyzn als...
   'They answered him: "We know that..."' (2a)

B. Postposed subject

(7) Zol kumen der evgnrimer fun vayngortn...
   'May the owner of the vineyard come...' (1f)

(8) Iz arovsgevoksn arum im a shpits fels
   'A mountain range grew up around him.' (5b)

II. V/2, no ES

A. Initial subject

(9) Der regn iz nisht gekumen
   'The rain didn't come' (6a)

(10) Du host zikh gornisht ibergerlozn oyu der elter
    'You haven't left anything for your old age' (4b)

B. Middle subject

(11) Oyb nisht vet di shuve nisht muter vern
    'If not the oath will not be permitted' (3a)

(12) Fun dort zenen zey gegangen in a fertn ort
    'From there they went to a fourth place' (1d)
C. Postposed subject

(13) Amol zenen gekumen in zayn shtot eyzlaybers
    'Once mule-drivers came into his town' (1b)

(14) Tsvishn di ganovim hobn zikh gefunen oykh yidn
    'Among the thieves were also Jews' (1f)

III. V/2, with ES

A. Middle subject (rare)

(15) Es iz shoyn der gantsar vinter ariber
    'The entire winter had passed' (5a)

B. Postposed subject

(16) S'iz aroys oyf im a gzar din fun himl tsu
    getovt vern
    'A decree went out from heaven that he was to
    be killed' (1d)

(17) S'hot gehersht a groyse trikenish in land
    'A great drought reigned in the land' (5a)

Type I, the V/l clause, has become known as the Yiddish
"consecutive" or "result" clause; standard textbooks (see §3
below) ignore the position of the subject however.

A clause in which the subject appears simultaneously
after the finite verb (or with the possibly intervening con-
stituents mentioned above) and at the end of the VP is am-
biguous as to Middle or Final field:

(18) Azov zogt der moshi: a shif...
    'Thus says the example: a ship...' (1d)

The purpose of this paper is to examine the V/l, verb-
initial or consecutive construction in a number of texts in
order to determine its discourse function; a by-product is
a partial replication of Prince (1988).

2.0 Earlier work with the clause types. Prince (1988)
studied a corpus of initially 9,066 clauses, reduced to 1,804
by eliminating non-declaratives, clauses with no overt sub-
ject, all clauses with pronominal subjects (since they are
not postposable), and all clauses ambiguous between Middle
and Final field. Her figures are as follows:
Subject position: initial middle postposed TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>initial</th>
<th>middle</th>
<th>postposed</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V/1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/2, no ES</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/2, with ES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>1,804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the V/2, no ES clauses which do not have postposed subjects are quite unremarkable: those with Initial subjects (IIA) are simply standard SVO sentences, and those with Middle subjects (IIB) have some constituent in initial position which has triggered the verb-second rule. It is the remaining types which concern us. Prince's (1988) conclusions regarding the discourse functions of these clause types are:

(20) a. Postposed subjects (all):
Whether V/2 with ES, V/2 no ES, or V/1, postposed subjects "indicate that they do not represent entities which have already been evoked in the discourse" (or subdiscourse)--they represent either new entities or no entities at all.
(i) Those without ES (V/2 no ES; V/1):
These have constituents in their initial, or XP, position which are marked as representing either some previously evoked entity or some (other) entity presumed to be already known to the hearer," or, in the case of the V/1 sentences, they have the prior context, usually the preceding sentence, which "fills" the XP in some sense and similarly represents previously evoked entities or entities presumed known.

b. V/2 with ES, with Middle subject:
Uncertain, but "highly marked" and "perhaps reserved for contexts where the subject is marked as being neither an already evoked entity nor an entity which will be referred to subsequently."

---

3I am of course omitting Prince's examples and arguments.
The type not discussed as such by Prince is V/I with Middle subject, and these have been the major focus of my own study; I will be making some generalizations about the V/I with postposed subjects as well.

3.0 V/I (consecutive) clauses.

3.1 Background on these clauses. V/I, or consecutive (Weinreich 1976:1949:§§76, 81; Schaechter (1986:193-4) uses Weinreich's term and also the term rezultat-zyeyder 'resultative (word)order') clauses have not to my knowledge been the subject of a systematic study; while they are not the major concern of Prince (1988), those with postposed subjects do of course come under her generalization (20): their subjects are predicted to be non-resumptive in the sense explained there (this holds also for my data; see below). As for those with Middle subjects we may note that Prince's generalizations imply that Middle subjects are expected to represent entities which have previously been evoked in the discourse, or (conceivably) to behave the same as postposed subjects. Prince has hypothesized (p.c.) that "middle position strongly favors subjects which, if referential, refer to entities already in the discourse... or to entities which are inferentially related to ones already evoked in the discourse." (This holds for my data; see below.)

What is the general discourse function of V/I? Let us extend Prince's hypothesis (20a(i)), which concerns V/I with postposed subjects, to the following generalization:

(21) V/I clauses, whether Middle or postposed subject, have an empty XP which is "filled" in some sense by the prior context, usually the immediate prior context, so that they explicitly refer to either previously evoked entities or (other) entities presumed to be known to the hearer.

This hypothesis claims basically that V/I clauses are very similar to V/2 no ES clauses in which the subject is non-initial: both have an XP position strongly linked to previous material. This means that V/I clauses with Middle subject have a double connection with previous material, (a) via their subjects and (b) via their empty XP.

There seems to be a general consensus among grammarians of Yiddish that V/I clauses are prototypically result clauses. Birnbaum (1979:§209(d), (e)) implies, for instance,
that he sees the construction as the result of ellipsis of certain conjunctions, such as deriber, derfar, makhmes dem, all having meanings like 'therefore', 'so' and all of which, when actually present, require the verb to follow:

(22) Deriber hob ikh gevart ovf im
     Therefore I waited for him

Birnbaum states, "The conjunction may be omitted, but the word order will still have conclusive force." However he at once concedes: "The same construction appears even when there is clearly no causative connection."

Weinreich (1976:1949:81) writes regarding consecutive clauses as follows (I have romanized the examples):

(23) A consecutive clause describes actions which follow the events described in the preceding sentence. The consecutive clause may show either the result or the consequence in time of the first clause. The use of the consecutive clause implies the words "so," "therefore."

Weinreich's thinking, like Birnbaum's, on the analysis of consecutive clauses is hinted at rather than explicitly stated:

In sentences containing the imperative or the form with lomir ['let us'] or zol er, zoln zey ['may he,' 'may they']...the verb cannot be moved to first place; the conjunction to ['so'] is therefore used with the same effect as the consecutive word order in other sentences:

Dos bukh iz mayns, to gib mir es.
Mir hobn shoyn gegeyn, to lomir geyn.
Zi hot nokh nit geendikt, to zol zi blaybn.

['The book is mine, so give it to me.' 'We have already eaten, so let's go.' 'She hasn't finished yet, so let her stay.']

Since to and the consecutive order are in complementary distribution, to is at least a conceivable underlying conjunction for V/I clauses (other conjunctions may co-occur with the consecutive order; see below, §3.33), a move which
would collapse (in remote structure) V/1 clauses with V/2 no ES clauses with non-initial subjects. 4

The problem for this notion and for Weinreich's puzzling remark that the consecutive order has "the same effect" in declarative sentences as to in imperatives and hortatives, is that the meaning of to is distinctly conclusive, while many consecutive clauses lack conclusive force (see below for discussion), as Weinreich himself acknowledges when he says that mere "consequence in time" may be indicated by the consecutive order.

Zaretski (1929:235, §728) does not even single out resultative meaning: "The construction has the character of being bound to earlier or (more rarely) later speech."

The question of what is the function of V/I in Yiddish is not an idle one. Cohesion has been defined (Halliday & Hasan 1976:23) as "the dependence of one element on another for its interpretation." It seems that consecutive clauses must contain a cohesive device because a V/I sentence always follows other prior material and cannot (apparently) be interpreted fully without reference to this prior material.

What we have so far is Prince's (1988) generalization that postposed subjects do not represent an entity already evoked in the discourse (20a), plus generalization (21) to the effect merely that V/I clauses are linked (via their XP or initial position) to prior context. We would like to know the details of this, and just how V/I clauses differ from, for example, V/2 no ES clauses with Middle subjects, which also refer to prior context (via their XP, which in their case is not empty). We turn now from earlier work to my own study, beginning with a description of the texts I have used.

3.2 The texts. My texts are nineteen legends of the Tannaim and Amoraim written for young people, selected at random from vols. 1 and 3 of Menakhem Gets (pseudonym; full name Menakhem Mendl Gerlits), Bedarkhey Avoyseynu: In di Vegn fun Unzere Eltern, Jerusalem: Orayta, 1977. 5 These stories have two distinct advantages for my inquiry: (a) they are composed in a style which is naïve with respect to modern

4 Consecutive clauses are also never preceded by un 'and' (to my knowledge) but un is precluded as an underlying conjunction for consecutive clauses because it does not trigger the verb-second rule. 5 The Tannaim and Amoraim were interpreters of Jewish tradition in the first four centuries of our era. The complete reference to the Gets books is due to Moshe Taube.
standardizing trends, one which continues the tradition of mid-19th-century religious literature in Judeo-German; the author is very unlikely to have been influenced by normative works on Yiddish; (b) they make almost no use (only three examples in my texts) of IZ-sentences (Kahan-Newman 1988), which are themselves poorly understood but may be related in function to V/I sentences and would only complicate the study, I feel, at its initial stage.

The texts amount to somewhat less than 10,000 words. I arranged them into numbered segments beginning a new segment whenever the text began (a) a new written sentence and/or (b) an actual V/I clause or a potential one (i.e., V/2 no ES, regardless of subject position). 6 I then marked potential consecutive clauses with "0" and actual consecutive clauses also with "->", drawing in cohesive ties (in the sense of Halliday & Hasan 1976), the ties in these texts being entirely those of anaphora and repetition: either an anaphor in the V/I sentence (usually its subject) has an antecedent in the preceding discourse unit, or an NP (again usually its subject) in the V/I sentence is a repetition of an NP in the preceding unit. The subjects are Middle subjects; V/I clauses with postposed subjects are also tied but not by their subjects.

Obviously, I did not make the same eliminations as Prince (1988) (see above, §2.0): I included clauses with pronominal subjects because the majority of V/I clauses have pronominal subjects (a sign of their tie to prior discourse), and I included all clauses whether or not they were sentence-initial (I am not quite sure of Prince's procedure in this regard).

I give next one of the shorter stories as an example; it happens to be an entertaining one in its own right. Note in passing (I discuss it below, §3.34) that consecutive clauses are always tied, predominately by their (Middle) subjects, to immediately preceding units of discourse: segments, sentences, quotations.

6However a new written sentence in the text was not represented by a new numbered segment if it occurred within quoted speech.
Sample text: The Mule Drivers (lb)

1. R. Eliezar, der zun fun R. Shimon ben Yokhai, hot in zayne yunge yorn nicht gevolt lernen toyre.

2. Er hot beser gevolt zikh fardingen tsu trogn masoes far menshn oyt zayne akslen, vi tsu unterbovgn zayne akslen far dem yokh fun toyre.

3. Er iz geven shtark un kreftik un er hot zeyer fil gegesn.

4. Amol zenen gekumen in zayn shmot eyzl-traybers velkhe hobn gevolt aribertirn mel fun dort in di nonhe derfer.


6. Hobn zey gezen vi zayn vayb shtet un bakt broyt in ovvn un nebn ir zitst Eliezar un est, yedn broyt vos zi hot fun ovvn aroysguumen hot er ovvn ort gegesn, bis es iz shoyvn nicht geblibn mer keyn teyg in der knet-payle, un der ovvn iz geven leydik.

7. Hot zikh eyner fun di eyzl-traybers ongerufn un gezogt: "Es iz nicht anders nor az a shlekhter shlang ligt in der gederim fun dozikh yung" --hot a tsveyter zikh ongerufn.

8. "S'zet oys az ot der iz nicht geboyrn gevorn nor kedey tsu brengen a hunger oyt der veit" "It looks as if this one was born only to bring a famine into the world,"

'Rabbi Eliezar, the son of Rabbi Shimon ben Yokhai, in his youth did not want to study Torah.

He preferred hiring himself out as a burden-bearer, carrying burdens on his shoulders, to bending his shoulders to the yoke of Torah.

He was strong and powerful and ate a great deal.

One time there came into his town mule-drivers who wished to port meal from there to nearby towns;

they came by the house of Rabbi Shimon.

They saw how his wife was standing baking bread in the oven with Eliezar sitting there eating; every loaf that she took out of the oven he ate on the spot, until there was no more dough in the dough-tray, and the oven was empty.

One of the mule-drivers said, "It can only be that an evil serpent is lying in the belly of that boy"
This they were saying to each other, but Eliezar heard their talk very well and he already knew what to do to them.

When they had left their mules and had gone to bring their produce to load onto the mules, Eliezar took their mules on his shoulders and carried them one-by-one to the roof.

When the mule-drivers returned with their produce and didn't find their mules, they set up a cry that their mules had been stolen.

But then one raised up his eyes; he saw the mules on the roof;

they understood that this was the doing of Eliezar, since who else had the strength to take a mule on his shoulders and carry it to the roof?

They went into Rabbi Shimon's house and told him what his son had done to them.

"And why did he do it to you? Didn't you somehow insult him?"
"Neyn"--hobn zey geertfer--
mir hobb bloyz tsvishn zikh
geredt vunderndik oyf zayn
groysn koyekhin esn,
eyner hot gezogt az a
shlechter shleng ligt in
zayne gederim...

...un a tsveyter hot gezogt
az er iz gekumen brengen a
hunger oyf der velt...ober
mir hobb nisht gemeynt az
undzere reyd zoin kumen tsu
zayne oyern"

"Un farvos hot ir azelkhes
oykh bloyz tsvishn zikh
geredt?"--hot (zey) R. Shimon
vayter gefregt--tsi den est
er fun ayers? Der Bashefer
vos hot im bashafn hot oykh
bashafn zayn esn vos er
badarf, yetst geyt un bet im
mekhile un zogt im in mayn
nomen az er zol aykh aroys-
brengen di eyzlen.

Hobn (zey) azoy geton un
Eliezar hot zey aropgetrogn
zeyere eyzlen.

Ober anshot vos frier hot er
zey aroypgifrt eynem eynem
hot er zey yetst tsvey tsvey
in amol aroypgifrt,
un ale zenen geshtanen un hobb
zikh nisht gekent opvundern,
zye hobb nokh aza gyure bay a
mentsh nisht gezeyn.

"No"--they answered--
we were just talking
among ourselves wondering
at his power in eating;
one said an evil
serpent lay in his belly..

... and another said he
came to bring a hunger
into the world... but we
didn't mean for him to hear
us"

"And why did you say such
things even among your-
selves? Did he eat any-
thing of yours? The
Creator who made him also
made the food he needs;
now go and ask his pardon
and tell him in my name
to bring down the mules."

They did so and Eliezar
brought down their mules.

But instead of one by one
as he did before he brought
them two at a time,
and everyone stood there
unable to stop wondering
at him;
they had never seen such
strength in a human being
before.
3.0 Findings. My figures (compare those of Prince, (19)) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject position:</th>
<th>initial</th>
<th>middle</th>
<th>postposed</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V/1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/2, no ES</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/2, with ES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>355</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1 Comparison with Prince (1988). Note first that the proportions among the clause types are quite similar in the two studies, in spite of the differences in eliminations, except for the fact that my clauses include three times as great a proportion of V/2 no ES with Middle subject. I believe this is because of the heavier reliance, in stories for young people, on dialogue (as opposed, for example, to description) as a means of keeping the plot moving; a unit of quoted speech followed by an expression of the type "He answered then" accounts for nearly half of my V/2 no ES with Middle subject.

Note also the single instance of V/2 with ES, Middle subject, in my data:

(24) There was once a year of drought in Israel and a great thirst ruled the land,

The winter is mentioned only at this point in the story--not before and not after.

With regard to postposed subjects, regardless of the other two parameters, my data support hypothesis (20a) completely. In the examples that follow, in all the (a) and (b) sentences the subject is newly evoked, while in the (c) sentences the subject represents no entity:

(25) V/1, postposed subject

a. Zol kumen der evantimer fun vayngortn

'May the owner of the vineyard come' (1f)
b. Zenen dan geforn oyf a shif in yam raykeh sokhrim
'Rich merchants were then sailing in a ship at sea' (lg)

c. Hot im bafoyln der shlof
'Sleep overtook him' (5b)

(26) V/2, no ES, postposed subject

a. Amol zenen gekumen in zayn shtot eyzlraybers
'One time mule drivers came into his town' (1b)
b. In a tog hot getrofn R. Eliezar'v eyner a yesber
'One day a washer met R. Eliezar' (1f)
c. In emesn ober hot zikh virlikh nisht gevizn keyn regnboyzn
'In truth however no rainbow had actually appeared' (3c)

(27) V/2 with ES, postposed subject

a. S'hot gehersht a groyse trikenish in land
'A great dryness reigned in the land' (5a)
b. S'iz im gegeben gevorn reshus
'Permission was given him' (3b)
c. S'iz mir yetst nisht geblibn keyn gelt
'I have no money left' (1d)

In a single case in my texts a postposed subject represents an entity previously occurring in the discourse--but this postposed subject is unusual in that it is separated from its antecedent by another clause also with postposed subject:

[Then R. Eliezar turned to the disciples and said, 'Now I will tell you what has happened here: be it known, my brothers and friends, that it was heaven that brought us here, for if I were not here now the snake would have done a great wrong.']
The second postposed subject (that of sentence (b)), 'the snake' is evoked two sentences back, whereas we expect it, being postposed, to represent a new entity or no entity. It is quite possible that a series of clauses with postposed subjects constitutes a sub-discourse; it seems clear that we would need to see more of these cases in order to hypothesize. But this one case out of 39 postposed subjects surely leaves (20a) quite viable.

3.32 Function of V/I clauses. I classified the 219 V/I clauses in my texts as follows:

(28) (i) clearly resultative in force - 124
(ii) conversational tags with
  verba dicendi - 57
(iii) not clearly resultative in force,
  but having prior text as background
  or describing events following
  events described in prior context - 35
(iv) adversative - 3

Type (ii)--expressions like '..., said the Rabbi'--are surely resultative and so constitute a subset of Type (i), so the total number of clear result clauses among the V/I is 181 or 82% of all V/I clauses. Some typical examples of these follow.
(29) a. [Elijah took one end of the rope and R. Yehoshua the other end, and with the rope Elijah measured the walls of the building, and he built there a great palace of a hundred and eighty rooms.]

Hot R. Yehoshua zikh nokhmer gevundert...
'Rabbi Yehoshua was even more amazed..' (3b)

b. [The pearl is absolutely priceless; don't be too hasty to sell it but merely take for the time being three dinars and go buy what you need for the holiday...]

Hot R. Shimon azoy geton
'R. Shimon did as he was told!' (2a)

c. [In the middle of the night Elijah arose and said to R. Yehoshua, "Get up!"]

Iz er oyfgeshtanen
'He got up' (3b)

Conventional conversational tags of the type (30) require no further comment:

(30) ...un R. Yokhanan hot vider gezogt...
'...and Rabbi Yokhanan said again...'

Hot R. Khiyai ongehoyn veynen,
'Rabbi Khiyai began to weep;'

hot im R. Yokhanan gefregt: "Farvos veystu?"
'Rabbi Yokhanan asked him, "Why do you weep?"

Hot er geentfert: "Vayl du host zikh gornisht
'He answered, "Because you have left nothing
 helberglozn oyf der elter"
for your old age." (4c)'

Examples of Type (iii):

(31) a. [If you ask anything further, I will separate myself from you,"Elijah said to him.]

Zenen zey avek fun dortn in a tsveytn ort,
' THEY left there and went to another place,
zenen zey ongekumen bay eynem groysn gvir.
and arrived at the home of a very rich man' (3b)

7These expressions were classified resultative only if they marked a turn-taking: often the first such expression in a conversational exchange was a Type (i) or (iii).
b. [One day he was walking on the road,]

Hot er gez'en a mentshn vi er plantst a
bokser-boym

'He saw a man planting a carob tree' (5b)

c. [It was the eve of Yom Kippur, when the people
of Akhbaraya were very busy; the sages had
his bed taken from the attic and brought to
the cave where his father was buried.]

Hobn zey getrofn dort a shlang vos ringlt arum
dem ayngang fun der meara

'They found there a snake circling the entrance
to the cave' (1h)

In (31a) the sentence preceding the V/l sentence brings to
a close one episode in the story. The V/l sentence begins
a new episode; the function here seems to be simply to mark
the event described in the V/l clause as immediately
following upon the last-mentioned event. The preceding
event provides background for the event reported in the
V/l clause. This is even clearer when the verb in the V/l
clause is a verb of perception rather than an action verb,
as in (31b) and (31c).

The informal use of the conjunction 'so' in English is
similar in function to V/l of Types (i) and (iii), though it
seems to be limited to action verbs:

'So they went to another town...'

'So he said to the guy...'

'So he suddenly saw a snake...'

The three V/l which do not seem to fall into any of the
first three categories are given in (32).

(32) a. [The Angel of Death said, "Give me
my knife!"

Hot R. Yehoshua nisht gevolt opgebn
'R. Yehoshua didn't want to give it up'(3c)

b. [He said to them, "It's me--Khoni Hamagel!"

Hobn zey im nisht gegloybt
'They didn't believe him' (5b)

c. ["Therefore turn back from your path!"

Iz der shlang geblibn shteyn
'The snake remained in place' (1d)

The examples in (32) all seem quite clearly adversative. Ac-
cording to Schaechter (1986:61) special intonation is re-
quired on the V/l clause for this meaning.
There are a few cases in my data where strictly speaking the event-result relationship is reversed while the sequentiality of the events is maintained: these are all V/1 clauses preceded by imperatives:

(33) a. [Rabbi Eliezar again spoke to him and said, "Snake, snake! I know your desire and your longing; turn back from your path;"
    vestu trofn a goy a roshe vos hot shlekhts
geton eynem a yidn
    'you will find a wicked gentile who has wronged a certain Jew' (ld)

b. ['Now go to the gentile who has been killed and lock in his bosom;']
    vestu dort gefinen nokh a baytl gelt
    'you will find there another purse of money' (ld)

Apparently sequence of events takes precedence over the resultative function; e.g., in (33a) finding the gentile follows turning back, but finding the gentile is the reason, rationale, or background for the act of turning back. Of course in a sense it is also the result; we can say the same of (33b).

3.33 Conjunctions with V/1 clauses. An obvious possibility is that the conjunctions used with V/1 clauses will give clues as to their discourse function. Out of my 219 V/1 clauses only ten have conjunctions, namely dan 'then', alzo ("Germanisms" are prominent in these texts) 'therefore', and deriber 'therefore'. The latter two account for eight of the ten. Examples:

Hot R. Shimon dan gezogt gevise verter
'R. Shimon then said certain words' (la)

Zolstu alzo nemen dem baytl un es firn tsu
    yenem yidn
    'You must therefore take the purse and take it to that Jew' (ld)

Hob ikh deriber geharget zayn ku
'I therefore killed his cow' (3b)

Obviously these conjunctions are the very ones which correspond to the notions of result (alzo, deriber) and sequence (dan). Note that such examples militate against a deleted
'therefore' in first position, as implied e.g. by Birnbaum (§3.1, above).

3.34 Ties in V/l clauses. Ties are the major cohesive device studied by Halliday & Hasan (1976). Very simply, a tie is a relation of anaphora, repetition, lexical subordination, etc. between a clause S and its prior context, such that S can be fully interpreted only by resolution of the relationship. It seems quite clear that V/l order is itself a cohesive device.

Beyond this, however, we can make the following generalization: although ties occur in many places throughout a discourse,

(34) a V/l clause is always tied to its immediately preceding discourse unit (usually sentence or quotation), most often via a middle subject.

Note "middle subject." V/l clauses with postposed subjects are often tied (I have only eleven of these in my data so it is hard to generalize) but not via their subjects, which as we have seen (above, §§2.0, 3.31) do not refer to entities previously mentioned in the discourse.

Several examples of ties can be seen in the sample text given in §3.2. Segments 5-7, 14-16 and 22 of that text are tied, all via their subjects. Another example, involving quotations as the domain of the tie, is (35).

(35) **R. Shimon** iz bay di sude geven zeyer in a getbybenem shtimung.

0→ Hobn im di khakhomim gefregt, far vos iz der Raynt azoy freylekh mne vi in andere teg?

0→ Hot er zey geentert "Vayl in dem hayntikn tog vet aropkumen tsu mayn zun R. Eliezar a heykhre heylike neshome oys fir fliglen. Izbay aza sude hob ikh a gantse simkhe."

0→ Hot er gezetst zayn zun R. Eliezar'n lebn im, um hot im gezogt, "Zits, mayn zun, zits. Vayl fun hayntikn tog verstu geheylukt un duv vest vern gerekhnt tsvishn di heylike layt."

0→ Hot (R. Shimon) dan gezogt gevise verter, un bald hot arumgenumen di shtub a fayer fun himl.

0→ Un di khaveyrim hobn gezen vi a roykh geyt aroys fun shtub dem gantsn tog.
'R. Shimon was in a very heightened mood at the feast.
The sages asked him why he has happier on this day than on other days?
He answered them, "Because today a higher, holy and four-winged soul will descend to my son R. Eliezar. At such a feast, my joy is complete.
So he sat his son R. Eliezar beside him, and said to him, "Sit, my son, sit. For from this day on you will be sanctified and reckoned among the holy ones."
Then R. Shimon said certain words, and immediately a fire from heaven surrounded the house.
And the disciples saw a smoke rising from the house the entire day.' (la)

As noted, many non-V/I clauses are tied in just the same way as V/I clauses: ties are generally very frequent in texts of all kinds. However, in these Yiddish texts, in cases where minimal contrast can be found--cases in which two clauses, one V/I and one not, have the same main verb--the V/I clause is tied as per (34) while the non-V/I clause lacks ties. This is consistently true in my texts; I have no doubt that overall it represents a strong tendency. Examples follow.

(36) a. Verb = zen 'see'
Non-consecutive order:
Hot R. Shimon dan gezogt gevise verter, un bald hot arumgenumen di shtub a fayer fun himl.
Un di khaveyrim hobn gezon vi a roykh geyt aroys fun shtub...
'Rabbi Shimon then spoke certain words, and at once a fire from heaven encircled the house.
And the disciples saw smoke rising from the house...' (lb)
Consecutive order:
Amol zenen gekumen in zayn shtot...[cy2i-traybers]
Hobn [cy2i] gezon vi zayn vayb shtet...
'They saw how his wife stood...' (lb)
b. Verb = *geyn* 'go'

Non-consecutive order:

Hot R. Eliezar oysgerufn: "Voyl iz undzer keylek..."

Dan _zenen di khevraye tsugegangen tsu_ R. Yosey'n un hobn im gezogt...

'Rabbi Eliezaz, "Well is our portion..."
Then the disciples went to Rabbi Yosey and said to him...

Consecutive order:

_R. Yosey Liz a mol ayngefan in a shтарке krenk._

_Iz R. Eliezar zayn edem im gegangen bazukhn un mevaker-koyle zayn._

'Rabbi Yosey once fell very ill.
Rabbi Eliezar his son-in-law went to visit and comfort him.'

(1e)

c. Verb = *kern* 'turn'

Non-consecutive order:

_Vi der shlang hot dos gehert hot er zikh bald oysgedret oyf tsurik un er hot genuzen shnel loyfn, biz er iz tsurik gekumen tsu der meara._

Dan _hot R. Eliezar zikh gekert tsu di khaveyrim..._ 'When the snake heard this he turned back at once and began running rapidly, until he was back at the cave.

Then Rabbi Eliezar turned to the disciples...'

(1d)

Consecutive order:

_Ober ot hobn zey oyfgeyoybn zeyere oygn un hobn derzen far zikh a sheynem feld vos iz badekt gevorn mit tepikher fun frishe grozn, ayngefanst mit gute beymer... un kiler vaser-kvalm hobn geflosn dort in to._

_Hobn zey zikh ale dort gekert un hobn zikh anider gezest..._ 'But now they lifted up their eyes and saw before them a beautiful field covered with carpets of fresh grasses, planted with good trees...and cool water fountains were flowing there in the valley.

They all turned aside there and sat down...'(1d)
d. Verb = zogn 'say'

Non-consecutive order:

Hot der shlang bald opgelozn dem kerper fun dem goy, hot aropgeboyn zayn kop un er iz farshvundn gevorn in zayn lokh.

Dan hot R. Eliezar gezogt tsu dem vidn...

'The snake at once released the body of the gentile, lowered his head and disappeared into his hole.

Then Rabbi Eliezar said to the Jew...' (1d)

Consecutive order:

Hot er gezetst zayn zun R. Eliezar lebn im, un hot im gezogt: "Zits, mayn zun, zits. Vayl fun hayntikh tog verstu geheylkt un du vest vern gereknt tsvishn di heylike layt."

Hot (R. Shimon) dan gezogt gevise verter...

'He seated his son Rabbi Eliezar beside him, and said to him, "Sit, my son, sit. For from this day you are holy and you will be counted among the holy ones."

Rabbi Shimon then said certain words...' (1d)

Many other examples could be given.

There are two small classes of exceptions to (34). One consists of clauses in which the subject is the in-
definite pronoun me(n) 'one'.

(37) Zayn muter hot dershmekt a reyekh fun a gutn esn un s'hot ir genuen zeyer khaleshn dos harts.

Iz men gekumen tsu Rebn fregn vos m'zol ton.

'His mother smelled the aroma of something good to eat and she began to long for it.

(4a) (So) they came to the Rabbi to ask what to do.'

I am not sure just how to handle these; it is true that in general one knows (at least is able to infer) which persons are referred to by an "indefinite" pronoun, and here one may claim me(n) is tied to zayn. But in fact the story does not indicate just who came to the Rabbi. So in other cases. But we might want to stop short of calling me(n) anaphoric in any event.

The other class of exceptions consists of tokens of the
formula found near the end of some stories, *dertseyln di khakhomim* 'the sages recount':

(38) **Er hot dan geleyent oyf zikh dem posek:**

*di toyre iz vi a shif fun sokhrim vos brengt fun vaytn ir broyt (gemaynt dermit di mayse fun di sokhrim mitn shif vos zenen in shkus fun zayn toyre nitsl gevorn un hobn im gebrengt hilf).*

*Dertseyln di khakhomim: di ale yorn fun(zayn) yesurim iz keyner nisht geshtoron far zayn tsayt.*

He then applied to the situation the following verse: the Torah is like a ship of merchants who bring their bread from afar (meaning thereby the matter of the merchants in the ship who were saved by virtue of his teaching and brought him help).

The sages recount that in all the years of his suffering no one died before his time.'

Here there is a tie, but not in the main clause; and di khakhomim 'the sages' are abruptly introduced at this point, and as the subject of a V/l clause. Prince points out (p.c.) that (a) this is a case of field ambiguity (cf. above, §1.1): we do not know whether di khakhomim is in the Middle field or the Final field. If we assign it to Final field then it is postposed, which is what we expect for a newly introduced entity. Also (b) dertseyln di khakhomim is a formulaic gloss of Hebrew *omru khakhomim* 'said (the) sages'--and of course classical Hebrew is VSO. The phrase would have been common in the sources for these stories.

3.35 Conclusion. We find, then, that V/l clauses are tied to their immediately preceding discourse units, and, as claimed by Weinreich, Birnbaum and other Yiddish grammarians they do have resultative, sequential or adversative sense, in about that order of frequency.⁸ Prince's hypothesis regarding subjects in Middle field (§3.1 above) is supported by my data, though in order to focus on V/l clauses I have not given examples, as is her claim regarding postposed subjects (20). Both of us found a mysterious paucity of V/2 ES clauses with Middle verb: fewer than .1% (cf. (20b))

⁸Note that these relationships may be either internal or external, in the sense of Halliday & Hasan (1976:241ff), i.e., relating either to the event or to the report of the event.
4.0 Historical notes. Clauses like the Yiddish V/l clauses, at least those with Middle subjects, have played a role in the history of Standard German and there has been some speculation as to their origin. Maurer (1926: §§67-76), summarizing a considerable body of research of his own, concludes that the construction was common in OHG with all types of verb, began to disappear in late OHG times and died out completely in early MHG. From the middle of the 15th century it appears again, especially in writings based on Latin models and beginning with verbs of saying (verba dicendi), whence it spread to clauses with other verbs by analogy. Biener (1926:248-255) offers several pages of further examples with various types of verb from the 15th century on.

Why does Maurer regard verba dicendi as the point of initiation, as it were, for the renewal of the V/l clause? Because of the question formula (1926:199-200, my trans.):

The Latin influence is a major factor, but by itself it does not explain why the phenomenon was [originally-KM] limited to verbs of saying. A second factor was that these verbs were already in what amounts to initial position after quotations. In such cases as "Das ist sehr schön," sagte der Mann the phrase sagte der Mann is frozen into a formula and then used in direct speech as well. This could have taken place at any time; in the 15th century the Latin models gave it a special impetus. The diffusion of the new type follows from the laws of analogical formation and requires no further explanation.

When I began my study, I found verbs of saying to be so frequent in Yiddish V/l clauses that I thought something like Maurer's hypothesis was needed to account for them. But in stories, reported speech acts are common. In any event, to see verba dicendi as the point of initiation is merely to put the question a step further back.

Fleischmann (1973:211) cites a remarkable construction rarely mentioned in grammars:

Er fiel beinahe um vor Müdigkeit,
hatte er doch zwei Nächte nicht geschlafen.
'He almost fell over from exhaustion, (for) he had not slept for two nights.'

Unlike in Yiddish, here the result clause comes first.
German grammarians have also speculated on the stylistic effect of V/I clauses in German in those cases where they are (marginally) found. Maurer noted the construction in the Schriftsprache of his own time in comic strips, in the usage of certain novelists to create an archaic flavor, and in serialized newspaper novellas where he refers to it as an affectation (Maniertheit) (1926:210).

Fleischmann (1973:210-21), in a comprehensive study of all types of sentence-initial verb in German, includes our topic under two headings: (a) folk-song flavor and (b) slang in narratives. His characterization is rather interesting (1973:220, my trans.):

Most of all it gives a narrative a certain urgency. The individual events are somewhat loosely chained together; there is insufficient distance between them to allow them to be put into any relationship other than the natural one provided by the course of the events themselves or by the course of their associations in the mind of the speaker.

He quotes Brinkmann to the same effect (Brinkmann 1962:477, my trans.):

The situation-determined initial position of the verb attests to the dialogic nature of speech, while the second position (our Middle field-KM) may serve to provide material that is independent of the situation.

These remarks are rather vague but they do point up the problematic nature of the V/I clause and suggest thinking with regard to Standard German similar to that advanced for Yiddish in Prince (1988) and in this paper.10

---

10 It is unfortunate that the valuable observations of Hall (1979:§5) were not available to me until after this paper was completed. Her native-speaker's intuitions appear fully consistent with my findings, but her attempt to state rules for the use of V/I clauses and her concept of "Narrative Sequence" deserve attention that I was not able to give them.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story</th>
<th>Pages in Gets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The bar-mitzvah</td>
<td>1a III. 7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mule-drivers</td>
<td>1b 12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught by Elijah the Prophet</td>
<td>1c 19-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trust is returned</td>
<td>1d 25-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The resurrection</td>
<td>1e 44-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Eliezar accepts suffering</td>
<td>1f 55-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Eliezar's wife departs</td>
<td>1g 64-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cave departure</td>
<td>1h 70-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A pearl from heaven</td>
<td>2a 79-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tsaddik's decree fulfilled</td>
<td>2b 86-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A question of a foot</td>
<td>2c 95-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation with the Messiah</td>
<td>3a 99-103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A walk with Elijah the Prophet</td>
<td>3b 103-115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alive in Paradise</td>
<td>3c 115-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Tsaddik before birth</td>
<td>4a 123-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This world vs. the world to come</td>
<td>4b 125-128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah the best merchandise</td>
<td>4c 128-131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even good should be in moderation</td>
<td>5a I. 17-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventy years of sleep</td>
<td>5b 26-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The questions are resolved</td>
<td>6a 33-43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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