KATHARINA KUPFER

POSSIBLE SLOTS IN THE OPENING OF A PĀDA

This paper deals with two questions: the first one concerns the order of the "initial string" in the opening of a pāda within the text of the Ṛgveda, if the string contains a demonstrative pronoun. The second question concerns demonstrative pronouns as well as particles insofar as they show traces of an older clitic state.

Most of the Vedic demonstrative pronouns are stressed (*ad s, id m, et d, t d*), only one (the defective *a-*) is clitic. The pronoun *enad*, which is called a demonstrative in various grammars and dictionaries is in fact a non-grammaticalized pronoun of the third person already in the Ṛgveda. Therefore I will neglect it.

The stressed forms are normally followed by only one clitic word, but there are some instances showing a combination of two words. Normally an alternation of stressed and unstressed words will be found as it is shown by Hock.[1] Clitic wordforms however can appear several times in the initial string as shown in the first table.

Slots	1	2	3	4	5	noun	Example
imám	*ū*	*ṣú*	*vo*			*átithim*	RV VI.15.1
imáṃ			*no*	*agne*		*adhvarám*	RV VI.52.12
imáṃ		*sv*	*àsmai*		*hṛdá ā́*	*sútaṣṭam*	RV II.35.2
enā́			*vo*		*agním*	*námasā*	RV VII.16.1
asyá				*híraṇyapāṇe*	*prábhṛtāv*	*ṛtásya*	RV VII.38.2
imā́	*u*	*ṣú*		*śrudhī*		*gíraḥ*	RV II.6.1

1. H.H. Hock, What's a nice word like you doing in a place like this?, *in Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 22/1 (1992), p. 39-87.

The instances are choosen from a set of samples of the demonstrative pronoun *idám*. As illustrated by the table there are five possible slots between the demonstrative *idám* and its syntactically related noun. Two examples:

(1) RV VI.15.1
     imám** ū ṣú vo **átithim uṣarbúdhaṃ
     víśvāsāṃ viśm̐ pátim r̥ñjase girm̐ |
     vétíd divó janúṣā kác cid m̐ śúcir
     jiyók cid atti gárbho yád ácyutam ||
     "I rush with my praise towards your **guest here**, well, the one early awake, the lord of all clans. Since he desires (viz. food) during the day, (who is) shining already at his birth. Since long ago the new-born eats the solid."

(2) RV VI.52.12
     imáṃ** no agne **adhvarám
     hótar vayunaśó yaja |
     cikitvm̐n daíviyaṃ jánam ||
     "Offer our **sacrifice here**, o priest Agni, – as (someone, who) knows the order – you, who knows the divine people!"

The first slot after the accented element is filled by a connecting particle (*u* in the example no. 1). The second one by an attidudinal evaluation of the speaker, i.e. *ṣu*. The following slots (number three up to five) are filled by elements of the sentence construction as the genitive or the indirect object as well as vocatives.

Example number three shows a formulation (in pāda c) with the finite verb between the demonstrative pronoun and its noun. Here the question arises whether *imm̐s gíras* is a noun phrase or not, in the latter case it would be an apposition. The metre of R̥gveda II.6 is the Gāyatrī verse, which contains eight syllables.

(3) RV II.6.1
     imám me agne samídham
     imm̐m upasádaṃ vaneḥ |
     imm̐** u ṣú śrudhī **gíraḥ ||

"Come to like my firewood here, o Agni, the worship here and hear <u>well my</u> **current song of praise**."

It is possible to change the word order and keep a long syllable in the third last position, which is necessary for the Gāyatrī metre.

imā́ u ṣú śrudhī gíraḥ
v - v - v - v x
*imā́ u ṣú gíraḥ śrudhi
v - v v v - v x
*śrudhy u ṣú imā́ gíraḥ
v - v v v - v x

But by doing so, you will end up with a worse rhythm and the parallelism of the verse is disturbed. The ideal metrical type can be found, as it is shown by Gippert [2], in the original formulation, where long and short syllables are arranged in a iambic rythm. One can conclude from examples like this, that the metrical (and poetic) structure in the Ṛgveda is more important than all other levels.

It is possible however to find within the metrical frame traces of an older rhythmic structure.

(1') RV VI.15.1
imám ū ṣú vo átithim uṣarbúdham
víśvāsāṃ viśā́m pátim r̥ñjase girā́ |
<u>*vétíd*</u> *divó janúṣā kác cid ā́ śúcir*
jiyók cid atti gárbho yád ácyutam ||
"I rush with my praise towards your guest here, well, the one early awake, the lord of all clans. Since <u>he desires</u> (**it**, viz. food) during the day, (who is) shining already at his birth. Since long ago the new-born eats the solid."

The already quoted stanza Ṛgveda VI.15.1 shows in páda c a

    2. J. Gippert, Neue Wege zur sprachwissenschaftlichen Analyse der vedischen Metrik, in *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*, ed. by Heiner Eichner. Hans Christian Luschützky unter redaktioneller Mitwirkung von Velizar Sadovski, Prag, 1996, p. 97-125.

combination of two words. This merger of the root *vī* "be eager for, desirous of" and the accented particle *íd* "just, indeed" can't be splitted up into their pausa forms without getting a hypermetric pāda.

Another example to strengthen this: in some verses the demonstrative pronoun is not at the very beginning of a páda, but in the third position of the sentence. Within these verses there are cases like the following:

(4) RV I.1.6
   yád aṅgá dāśúṣe tuvám
   ágne bhadrám kariṣyási |
   táv̄ét tát satyám aṅgiraḥ ||
   "When, Agni, you want to do fortunate (things) indeed for the worshipper, <u>then</u> that (will became) true **by you**, o Aṅgiras!"

This verse it is not possible to read as *táva ít* (as two words) in páda c without getting a hypermetric páda. This is a further support for Gippert's thesis [3], that some particles (among others, *ít*) were clitic in a pre-Vedic stage.

For the particle *íd* it is commonly assumed that *íd* is etymologically connected to the anaphoric pronoun in Latin *is*, *ea*, *id*. The form of the particle *íd* continues the nominativ/accusative singular form of the neuter. So one can think of *íd* in Ṛgveda II.6.1 as an old direct object, not as a particle. *íd* in the function of a direct object would be used for textcohesion, that is cataphoric to *ácyutam* "solid (thing)". The verbal root *vī* can be constructed with an accusative, but that is facultative. As illustrated by example number four, one can only find traces of this use. Both verses use *íd* as a particle as well. According to the concordance of Lubotsky [4] the particle *íd* is testified eighthundred and nine times in the Ṛgveda [5]. At the moment I want to speak only of traces of such a use.

---

3. J. Gippert *Indo-European Word Order in Main and Subordinate Clauses?* Annual meeting of the DGfS. Konstanz, 1999, Handout

4. A. Lubotsky *A Ṛgvedic Word Concordance. I: A N. II: P H* (=American Oriental Series, 82, 83), New Haven, Conneticut, 1997.

5. One would have to check all the verbs in their construction, wheather they take an obligatory or a facultative direct object to decide that question. Having done this, it would be possible to decide whether the form *īd* can still be found in traces as a anaphoric and/or cataphoric pronoun in the Ṛgveda or not.

There is an other particle in the Ṛgveda, that is used as well as an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun, that is *īm*. It belongs to the same demonstrative stem and continues the same Indo-European demonstrative as the particle *íd*.

sg.	Vedic			Gatha-Avestan			Indo-Iranian		
	m.	n.	f.	m.	n.	f.	m.	n.	f.
nom.	–	(*íd*)	–	–	(*īṯ*)	–	–	*i-d	–
acc.	*īm* *ī*	*ī* *īm*	*īm*	*īm* *ī*	*īṯ*	–	**ī-m*		**ī-m*
instr.	(*aná̄*)		(*ayá̄*)	–		–	**a-nā*		**a-yā*
dat. abl. gen. loc.	–	–		–		–	?		?

As shown in the second table the form *īm*, which appears in two hundred and eight passages of the Ṛgveda according to the concordance of Lubotsky (1997), can be an accusative singular of the masculine or feminine. By comparing it with the form *ī* which appears only eleven times in the Ṛgveda one finds that *ī* is actually the older form in the sense that it has been used to form a new accusative singular of the masculine (and feminine) already in Indo-Iranian time. Otherwise you have to explain the long *ī* of the form *īm* by assuming that it would continue an old accusative of the feminine. That explanation is given by various authors but mostly as a consideration. But the feminine form is less testified than the masculine in the corpus and why should the form of the accusative singular feminine be used to build up or to start to build up a new paradigm? It is much easier to assume, that the old form of the nominative/accusative plural neuter has been the starting point, when the singular form of the demonstrative pronoun, that is *íd*, had already become a particle. The form *íd* is also testified as a particle in Iranian languages Avestan or Old Persian, but not as pronoun. On the other hand the form *ī* is testified as the accusative of a pronoun in both branches of the Indo-Iranian family. Therefore I would like to assume, that in Indo-Iranian time a form, which

was a relic already, that is *ī* – the old form of the nominativ/accusative plural neuter, was used indifferently for all genders and numbers to assign an anaphoric accusative. On that basis a new accusative singular *īm* was created. It was probably indifferent concerning gender, although the masculine is best testified.

An example:

(5) RV II.14.10
ádhvaryavaḥ páyasódhar yáthā góḥ
sómebhir <u>*īm*</u> *pṛṇatā bhojám índram* |
védāhám asya níbhṛtam ma etád
dítsantam bhū́yo yajatáś ciketa ||
"Adhvaryus! You shall fill with soma drinks <u>him</u>, the bountiful Indra, as like with milk the udder of the cow (is filled)! I know about him (that), that is layed down for me: The holy one cares more for that one, who wants to give."

The root *pur* "fill" must as a simplex verb take a direct object in the Ṛgveda. Assuming that the end of the sentence is behind the finite verb and *bhojám índram* is added as an apposition, an accusative in the sentence is necessary and that accusative – in the function of the direct object to the finite verb *pṛṇatā* – is the word *īm*. This opinion is supported by the parallel accusative *ū́dhar* in the first pāda.

According to my investigation on this topic I know that at least 25% of all instances of *īm* in the Ṛgveda have to be seen as an accusative of a demonstrative pronoun. It might be up to 70% to match this view.

Three times the form *anā́* is testified in the Ṛgveda. *anā́* is most likely an adverb, but one could argue for a use as an attitudinal particle, too. *anā́* is translated by "now" in example number (6).

(6) RV IV.30.3
víśve canéd <u>*anā́*</u> *tvā*
devā́sa indra yuyudhuḥ |
yád áhā náktam ā́tiraḥ ||
"And all the gods <u>now</u> have not fought you, Indra, when you defined the days from night."

The form *anā́* is accented in RV IV.30.3 and without any hint on clisis. The accent however might be due to the use as an adverb. What is shown by this relic form is, that beside the form *anéna* – the regular instrumental singular masculine/neuter form of the stem *a-/i-* – that beside that form *anéna* a form *anā* was used (as the regular form) in a pre-Vedic stage. This view is supported [6] by the fact, that Vedic is influenced by the autocthonic languages of India. So the Dravidian languages have a pronoun *a-/i-* (cf. e.g. Andronov [7]), which is called a demonstrative pronoun in the grammars. This pronoun is used for textcohesion as well and described in that instances as a pronoun of the third person in the handbooks. It seems therefore, that under the influence of the Dravidian languages the inherited paradigm was split in its function. The demonstrativ pronoun, which is continued by Vedic *idám*, was used in Indo-Iranian time no longer for deictic as well as textcohesional use, but only for deictic one. At the same time a new paradigm of a pronoun was established, continued by Vedic *īd*, which contained only clictic forms, i.e. *id*, and was used in the same way as the phonological correspondend Dravidian pronoun *a-/i-* [8].

To summarize the different points: It is possible to find traces of an older use as clitics in slot number one. Words used in that slot can belong to an old paradigm of a demonḷstrative pronoun, which was used anaphoric and existed in Indo-Iranian time.

Bibliographic References:

Andronov, M.S.: 1978. *Sravnitel'naja grammatika dravidijskix jazykov*. Moskva: Izd. Nauka.

---

6. For this point I am indebted to all my collegues who discussed the subject with me during the conference for their critic and help, but especially Prof. Dr. Boris A. Zakharyin.

7. M.S. Andronov, *Sravnitel'naja grammatika dravidijskix jazykov*, Moskva, 1978, p. 274-275.

8. There seem to be a universal iconic principle, which connects nearness with high, front vowels. The identical form of the Indo-Iranian and Dravidian pronoun may be due to this typological feature, not caused by genetic relationship.

Gippert, J.: 1996. Neue Wege zur sprachwissenschaftlichen Analyse der vedischen Metrik, in *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler,* ed. by Heiner Eichner. Hans Christian Luschützky unter redaktioneller Mitwirkung von Velizar Sadovski. 97-125. Praha: Enigma corporation.

Gippert, J.: 1999. *Indo-European Word Order in Main and Subordinate Clauses?* Annual meeting of the DGfS. Konstanz: Handout.

Hock, H.H.: 1992. What's a nice word like you doing in a place like this?*, in *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 22/1:39-87.

Lubotsky, A.: 1997. *A R̥gvedic Word Concordance. I: A N. II: P H.* (=American Oriental Series, 82, 83). New Haven, Conneticut: American Oriental Society.