

**ELLIPSIS, BRACHYLOGY AND OTHER  
FORMS OF BREVITY IN SPEECH  
IN THE R̥GVEDA**

BY

**J. GONDA**

VERHANDELINGEN DER KONINKLIJKE NEDERLANDSE  
AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN, AFD. LETTERKUNDE

NIEUWE REEKS, DEEL LXVII, No. 4

1960

N.V. NOORD-HOLLANDSCHE UITGEVERS MAATSCHAPPIJ  
AMSTERDAM





There is a side of Vedic studies which has long been more neglected by modern scholars than it should be: it is diction and style.<sup>1)</sup> It is true that the language of the Ṛgveda is 'hieratic' and therefore to some extent exclusive and artificial. But it is on that account by no means a mere collection of syntactic oddities or bizarre 'figures of speech'. A considerable part of its syntactic and stylistic peculiarities may have been subject to hypertrophy or constitute the result of a onesided development; that does not mean that they are, all of them, abnormalities and, in principle, products of the strange imagination and the more or less eccentric literary inclinations of the ancient Indian poets.

Ellipsis and related phenomena are among the syntactic devices which have often been observed and ascertained by the students of the Veda, but never systematically and at the same time exhaustively described from a linguistic, and especially stylistic, point of view. They have up to recent times, if not passed over without comment,<sup>2)</sup> been mainly considered more or less striking or curious peculiarities, or poetic obscurities in which the language of that body of literature abounds. The terminological carelessness displayed in discussing various types of conciseness in speech and the almost complete indifference to their 'historical background', which characterizes the relevant notes of those scholars who paid much attention to 'ellipses' and other 'omissions', Oldenberg<sup>3)</sup> and Geldner,<sup>4)</sup> have no doubt tended to perpetuate the above opinion of what could, from another point of view, be studied as a long series of paragraphs on economy in language and literary art.

"Le style emphatique, enclin à l'hyperbole, abonde en traits singuliers que nous percevons comme autant d'ellipses, d'anacoluthes, de hardiesses de construction ou d'expression".<sup>5)</sup> "Plus encore qu'une mine de traits de langue singuliers, le Veda est un répertoire de procédés de style, non moins singuliers: les uns à tendance ou soubassement syntaxique (parenthèse, ellipse, anacoluthes, figura etymologica), les autres, morphologique

---

<sup>1)</sup> In this treatise words inserted in translations and corresponding to elliptic omissions in the original Sanskrit are as a rule marked by (sc. ...) or by (...), if there is no ambiguity; [...] indicates a sous-entendu; <...> a brachylogy, a case of haplogy or of ἀπό κοινού; (...) or (viz. ...) other shortenings in the original text. Geldner's Rig-veda übersetzt is as a rule quoted as Geldner, o.c., even if other works by the same author have been mentioned in the preceding footnotes.

<sup>2)</sup> E.g. by A. Bergaigne, Quelques observations sur les figures de rhétorique dans le Rig-Veda, Mém. de la Soc. de Ling. 4, p. 96; M. W. Easton, on the Vedic style, Proc. Am. Or. Soc. 1873, p. LXLIX; P. Regnaud, Le caractère et l'origine des jeux de mots védiques, Rev. d'Hist. des Rel. 16, p. 166.

<sup>3)</sup> H. Oldenberg, Ṛgveda. Textkritische und exegetische Noten, Berlin 1909; 1912.

<sup>4)</sup> K. Geldner, Der Rig-veda übersetzt, Harvard 1951.

<sup>5)</sup> L. Renou, in L. Renou et J. Filliozat, L'Inde classique, I, Paris 1947, p. 275.

(créations instantanées, haplogogie) ou phonétique (allitération, éventuellement rime)".<sup>6)</sup>

There does not even appear to exist a communis opinio about the extent to which this phenomenon, be it economy or exaggerated brevity, clumsiness or subtlety, is characteristic of Vedic literature. "Le plus souvent, en effet, ce qu'on décrit sous ce nom, de manière purement empirique, c'est le fait qu'à une phrase prise dans une langue donnée, il manque un élément plus ou moins important dont la nécessité semble résulter de ce que d'autres langues l'emploient — et notamment la langue propre à l'auteur de cette constatation".<sup>7)</sup> It is therefore not the least important part of my plan in writing this article to draw up a short inventory of the phenomena vaguely described as 'ellipsis' or 'brevity', to define them and to make an attempt to assign them their place in the framework of historical syntax.

Like many other translators Geldner has "die zum Verständnis notwendigen Ergänzungen in ( ) hinzugefügt".<sup>8)</sup> Although it often is a matter of opinion, how far this procedure, if once adopted, should be applied, and many bracketings encountered in Geldner's volumes are therefore hardly discussable, some preliminary remarks may, in connection with the other topics touched upon in this publication, be made here. Passing over such instances as ṚV. 1, 34, 5 *devatātā* "bei (versammelter) Götterschar", interpretations or elucidations of the type 1, 43, 9 *ṛtasya* "des (Welt-)gesetzes", 1, 48, 7 *ayukta* "(zur Fahrt) angespannt", 1, 61, 10 *abhi śravaḥ* "auf Ruhm (ausgehend)" or 1, 62, 4 "(im Bunde) mit" without comment,<sup>9)</sup> attention may first be drawn to 1, 51, 15 where *namaḥ* is, not incorrectly, rendered by "Huldigungs(lied)". Here we encounter a difficulty of frequent occurrence: many ancient Indian terms do not only denote a more or less 'abstract' 'idea', but also the manifestation of that 'idea'; often we rather should say that the 'idea' first and foremost exists in and through its manifestations. Thus *namaḥ* may stand for "bow, adoration, salutation", and for "the text conveying the adoration". As the sons are in a comparable way representatives of the father, *rudrāḥ* in 1, 64, 3 need not be rendered by "Rudra(söhne)".

Occasionally the addition of a bracketed word may however mislead the reader so as to suggest the occurrence of a real ellipsis. ṚV. 1, 26, 2 it reads *ni no hotā . . . / sadā . . . manmabhiḥ / agne divitmatā vacaḥ*: a translation "mit Dichtungen, mit glanzvoller Rede (geladen)" is of course warranted, but the instrumental which expresses the 'accompaniment' of

<sup>6)</sup> Renou, Histoire de la langue sanskrite, Lyon 1956, p. 21. For alliteration, figura etymologica etc. see my book Stylistic repetition in the Veda, Amsterdam 1959.

<sup>7)</sup> Renou, Le problème de l'ellipse dans le Rgveda, Études védiques et pāninéennes, I, Paris 1955, p. 29ff. The publication of this important chapter kept me from writing these pages for some years.

<sup>8)</sup> Geldner, Rig-veda übersetzt, I<sup>2</sup>, p. X.

<sup>9)</sup> That is not to say that one would subscribe to all these interpretations without the least reserve: cf. e.g. 1, 175, 2; 180, 6 "Lohnherr".

the subject in any activity<sup>10</sup>) is perfectly intelligible without any addition. In 1, 71, 10 *purā tasyā abhiśasteḥ* is, in the original text, certainly no case of ellipsis or brachylogy: *purā* may accompany an ablative so as to 'imply' a verbal concept:<sup>11</sup>) "bevor solcher Vorwurf (erhoben wird)". Nor is in 1, 105, 6 a participle "going, moving" needed: *aryamṇo . . . pathā* "auf dem Wege des . . . A. (wandelnd)"; cf. also 2, 35, 10; 5, 44, 5. Elsewhere again the Sanskrit accusative accompanying a verb — which expresses, in principle, an unspecified or unqualified relation between the nominal and verbal ideas — has no counterpart in German or English: hence, in 6, 1, 3 *rayim jāgrvāṃsah* "having watched with a view to possession".

Another difficulty crops up in cases such as 1, 63, 8 where *ūrjam* is rendered by "(Lebens)kraft", where we had better choose a more or less adequate translation without a bracketed element. Similar remarks apply to "(wut)entbrannt" for *tveṣah* in 1, 66, 6; 70, 11; "(Opfer)ordnung" for *ṛta-* in 1, 84, 4; cf. also 2, 23, 12.

As fractions are expressed by ordinal numbers which may be put alone (*viṃśam* "the or one twentieth part") "das vierte Viertel" would have been a possible translation of *turiyam* in 1, 164, 45. The German "gegenseitig" may be implied in the verb form of the original text (middle) so that the brackets may be omitted: e.g. 2, 34, 3. ṚV. 5, 45, 9 *yad asyorviyā dirghayāthe* "das auf seiner langen Fahrt sich weithin (erstreckt)" contains an example of an adverb functioning as a predicate.<sup>12</sup>)

Not infrequently the absence of a term in the original Sanskrit and the desirability of inserting it in the translation are conditioned by the different degree of familiarity with the situation on the part of the Indian hearer and the modern Western reader of these texts and by the different connotations conveyed by the Indian terms and their modern 'equivalents': cf. e.g. 5, 26, 2 *devām ā vitaye vaha*: "bring die Götter her zum Genusz (der Opfer)!"; 5, 30, 11 *sādaneṣu* "(Götter)sitzen"; 37, 5; 41, 8; 49, 3; 6, 7, 1.

Among the inconsistencies which detract something from the value and reliability of Geldner's translation is his habit of interpreting similar passages differently. Whereas for instance the word *vadhri-* "castrated, emasculated" is 1, 32, 7 and 33, 6 rendered by "der verschnittene (Stier)", the plural is 2, 25, 3 translated by "die (verschnittenen) Ochsen".

The above remarks do not alter the fact that part of the many insertions in Geldner's work may illustrate some salient differences between Sanskrit and German diction; cf. e.g. 1, 13, 2; 14, 3; 18, 3; 4, 19, 1; 5, 36, 4.

'Ellipsis' is one of those grammatical terms which is often misunderstood or rather imperfectly defined and partly confused, in the class-room and

10) For the 'instrumentalis circumstantiae' see J. S. Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, Leiden 1886, p. 50f.

11) Speyer, o.c., p. 118, § 161; Renou, Grammaire de la langue védique, Lyon 1952, § 421.

12) See e.g. B. Delbrück, Vergl. Syntax der indogerm. Sprachen, III, Strassburg 1900, p. 16ff.

scientific works, with other phenomena to which we should give their own names. Occurring already, in a grammatical sense, in Greek Antiquity, *ἔλλειψις* was used, by the Father of Syntax, Apollonius Dyscolus,<sup>13)</sup> to denote a construction which is shorter than might be expected on the strength of logical considerations and of the wrong starting-point of fictitious theoretical ideal constructions.<sup>14)</sup> Because he adhered to the incorrect view that a single accusative had, in Greek, to denote a person or object 'suffering' or undergoing the process expressed by the verb he, also incorrectly, concluded for instance that *τοῦτον φοβοῦμαι* "I am afraid of him" is an ellipsis instead of *διὰ τοῦτον φοβοῦμαι*. Such mistakes come home to roost: many generations built on on the foundations laid by Apollonius until these tendencies reached their culmination in the oeuvre of the Spanish scholar Sanctius (16th century) who exaggerated the possibilities of an ellipsis theory to such a degree as to contend that for instance Verg. Aen 4, 39 *nec venit in mentem quorum consederis arvis?* was, in many respects, elliptical, the 'original' and 'correct' expression being *nec venit tibi, o Dido, in mentem recordatio illorum hominum in quorum hominum arvis tu consederis?* It would, in 1959, be no use to observe that Sanctius was mistaken, and his theory a complete failure. Yet old and antiquated views and explications in linguistics are hard to kill and even now not all the consequences of the, in this respect, pernicious doctrines of former grammarians have been eradicated.<sup>15)</sup>

By ellipsis is here intended the phenomenon that part of an expression which is current in normal usage or part of a construction which is, in a given milieu, usual, is omitted, because at the moment of speaking (or writing) it may be dispensed with and inevitably and as a matter of course supplied by the audience or understood by them in the construction of the sentence.<sup>16)</sup> Neither the speaker nor the able and contemporaneous

<sup>13)</sup> Apollonius Dyscolus, De Syntaxi, p. 117, 19 B.

<sup>14)</sup> Compare also the remarks made by H. Schuchardt, Brevier, Halle S. 1928, p. 269.

<sup>15)</sup> See e.g. H. Paul, Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte<sup>5</sup>, Halle S. 1920, ch. 18; B. Delbrück, Vergl. Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen III, Strassburg 1900, p. 112ff.; O. Jespersen, The philosophy of grammar, London 1924 (1935), p. 306ff.; A. H. Gardiner, The Theory of speech and language, Oxford 1932, p. 50f.; 270; K. Bühler, Sprachtheorie, Jena 1934, p. 155ff.

<sup>16)</sup> Other, and objectionable, definitions were for instance given by J. Marouzeau, Lexique de la terminologie linguistique Paris 1933, p. 74; Kühner-Gerth, Ausf. Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, Satzlehre II<sup>4</sup>, Leverkusen (1955), p. 558. A. H. Gardiner, The theory of speech and language, Oxford 1932, p. 270 takes the term 'ellipse' in a wide sense so as to embrace all those types of incongruent function where the feeling of an omission is awakened. — According to Ch. Bally, Linguistique générale et linguistique française<sup>2</sup>, Berne 1944, p. 159 "l'ellipse (est) la sous-entente dans la parole, à une place déterminée du discours, d'une signe figurant dans un contexte précédent ou suivant"; I am afraid that this definition will lead to serious misunderstandings. See e.g. also E. Wellander, Studien zum Bedeutungswandel im Deutschen, II, Uppsala 1923.

hearer have in using or hearing a case of ellipsis consciously to seek for the term or terms omitted, though they may have a more or less faint notion of intending or understanding more than what has been said or heard. The omission is, as long as the case of ellipsis is not petrified,<sup>17)</sup> supplied by context and situation. It follows that part of the cases of ellipsis occurring in an ancient text may, for a modern reader, be very difficult to recognize, to discover or to understand. If the situation is temporally and locally the same for both speaker and listener, a single word may often suffice, but if they are not or if one comes to hear or to read words which are ambiguous brevity may even easily land those who know a language very well in difficulties: in the French *cette femme aime son fils plus que son mari* it is not clear whether *mari* is subject or object.

It follows that neither phrases such as the French *plutôt mourir!*; *quelle horreur!* or the Dutch *pauze!*; *brand!* "fire" — to which linguistically speaking nothing is to be supplied — nor omissions of those elements which for a correct understanding of the utterance are essential may be considered ellipses. Nor is an ellipsis a *sous-entendu*, that is: the non-repetition of an element which occurs in the same context: *he is six feet high, she five; he was dark and his brother fair*, an aposiopesis,<sup>18)</sup> or a brachylogy of which there may occur a great variety of sub-types, e.g. Hes. Op. 515 *διὰ ῥινοῦ βοός ἔρχεται, οὐδέ μιν ἴσχει* (viz. *ῥιμός*) "he goes even through an ox's hide; it (the hide as subject, but not expressed) does not stop him". It will therefore be necessary to reconsider, as far as will be possible, a large part of the places marked as elliptical by our predecessors, because, to quote Schuchardt,<sup>19)</sup> terminological uncertainties have the same effect on research as fog has on shipping. If they are left unsettled they may be the source of much confusion.

In colloquial language, among speakers who know each other well, or who being of the same intellectual level take interest in the same occupations, ellipsis is a very common phenomenon. As soon as they find themselves confronted with a well-known situation or are to speak about familiar subjects — and in these circles most situations are apt often to return, and most subjects of conversation are familiar — they may understand each other with half a word. The context and situation supply the hearer with so many elements which are necessary for the right understanding of an utterance, and so often enable the speaker to leave out what is — or sometimes what is thought to be — superfluous, especially when he supplies by gestures what he omits in speaking. It is from the very situation clear that the subject of an ancient Roman epitaph

<sup>17)</sup> M. Bréal, *Essai de sémantique*<sup>6</sup>, Paris 1921, ch. 15; E. Wellander, *Studien zum Bedeutungswandel im Deutschen*, 3 vol., Uppsala 1927–1928, passim; S. Ullmann, *The principles of semantics*, Glasgow 1951, 116f.; 238ff. For Fr. *capitale* < *ville capitale* etc. see also Bally, o.c., p. 147.

<sup>18)</sup> Otherwise: H. Paul, *Deutsche Grammatik*, IV, Halle a.S. 1920, p. 378?

<sup>19)</sup> Hugo Schuchardt, *Brevier, zusammengestellt von L. Spitzer*, Halle S. 1928, p. 334.

*sed cito me rapuit matricque dolore(m) reliquit* must have been *mors*, or that the verb was *iacet* in another epitaph *Dusmia Nothis hic*. There is no reason to suppose prehistoric Indo-Europeans to have shown, in this respect, fundamentally different behaviour. There is already in ancient texts a large number of expressions which may be considered petrified ellipses, cf. e.g. in Homer, *K* 542 δεξιῇ ἠσπάζοντο (sc. *χεῖρῃ*; cf. *v* 197 showing the complete phrase); Lat. *dextra* (sc. *manus*), Got. *taihswa*, Lit. *dešinė* etc.; Lat. *patria*, Gr. ἡ ξένη (sc. *γῆ*) etc.<sup>20</sup>) It has even been contended<sup>21</sup>) — and from the point of view of psychological linguistics not unjustly — that the ‘ellipsis’ arises from a situation which is ‘interpreted’ and ‘expressed’ primarily by gestures and other tacit references and only secondarily, if these means of understanding do not suffice, by words. “(Ellipsis) ist daher nicht ein Wegfallen von Gliedern, sondern gerade umgekehrt ein erster Ansatz sprachlicher Gestaltung”.<sup>22</sup>) That does however not alter the fact that many ellipses have become traditional: it would be a very hazardous procedure to interpret the ellipses of the Veda as if they were integrally and completely spontaneous and did not rest on similar phenomena in the language of predecessors and contemporaries. Many types of brevity in speech, especially the very frequent phenomenon of *sous-entendu* and most cases of ellipsis proper are not only a welcome and almost indispensable means of expelling from the spoken or written discourse those elements which are for practical purposes superfluous, but also a device to achieve a higher degree of cohesion between the parts of the utterance, to intensify the concentration of the mind, to induce the interlocutors to pay attention to context and situation and to utilize the data furnished by these in constructing their sentences.

An interesting elliptic phrase is *yadīdam* “if this (sc. is thus)”, “wenn dies (sich so verhält)”; ṚV. 1, 79, 2; 4, 5, 11. We might easily imagine that in the brisk conversation of ordinary people shortenings of this type, supplied by gestures, were far from rare: cf. in Latin, Ter. Andr. 175 *mirabar, hoc si sic abiret*; the Greek *αὖτως* in the sense of “just (as it was; as before)” or “just (as he pleased)”. The use of *iti* “thus, in this manner” alone, without a verb of speaking or thinking<sup>23</sup>) may, in essence, be likewise elliptical: 10, 130, 1 *pra vayāpa vayety āsate tate* “they are sitting by the woven (i.e. the sacrifice launched, undertaken) thus: ‘weave on! weave away’ ” seems to be founded on a typically popular or conversational inclination to brevity and economy. See also 10, 17, 1 *tvaṣṭā duhitre vahatam kṛnotīdāṃ viśvam bhuvanaṃ sam eti* “‘T. richtet seiner Tochter die Hochzeit aus’, auf solche Kunde kommt diese Welt zusammen” (G.),

<sup>20</sup>) See e.g. W. Porzig, *Die Namen für Satzinhalte im Griechischen*, Berlin 1942, p. 344; 348; E. Struck, *Bedeutungslehre*<sup>2</sup>, Stuttgart, 1954, p. 81f.; W. Havers, *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax*, Heidelberg 1931, p. 127; 245.

<sup>21</sup>) See K. Bühler, *Sprachtheorie*, Jena 1934, p. 155 and elsewhere.

<sup>22</sup>) H. Seidler, *Allgemeine Stilistik*, Göttingen 1953, p. 194.

<sup>23</sup>) See also B. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, Halle S. 1888, p. 16f.



but a shorter translation of *iti* would be preferable; 9, 6, 2 *abhi tyam madyam madam / indav indra iti kṣara*; 5, 52, 11.<sup>24</sup>) In all these instances it is context and situation that compensate for the brevity of the speaker.

Nurseries of many very common and completely fossilized cases of ellipsis are the 'Sondersprachen',<sup>25</sup>) the vocabularies of the divisions of the technical occupations and other interests within the greater speech-communities. The Latin *deserere*<sup>26</sup>) "to leave, abandon (with the implication of a cowardly running away)" used for instance with *exercitum, castra, duces*, dropped, in military language, its complement, assuming the sense of "deserting". The more exclusive the 'Sondersprache', the greater the chance that some of its ellipses remain unintelligible to outsiders: in the special vocabulary of the Roman Christians *consecutus est* (sc. *gratiam, sanctam*) meant "he was baptized" and in English slang *he was dressed regardless* (sc. *of expense*) does not refer to a careless way of dressing. Outsiders may derive profit from the fact that sometimes the complete expression remains, at least during a certain period, in use: *to strike* beside *to strike work*.

It does not a priori seem to be open to question that the special interests and the 'Sondersprache' of the ancient Indian priests, inspired poets and religious thinkers was also conducive to a luxuriant development of ellipsis and other forms of brevity in speech. Many words obtained a specialized sense because they were — either elliptically or not — used in special combinations which belonged to the phraseology of these poets. Thus R.V. 1, 71, 4 and elsewhere *math-* "to stir, whirl round, use friction etc." is used for "to produce fire by rapidly whirling round or rotating a dry stick", 1, 71, 4 with the pronominal object *im*. The term *purohita-*<sup>27</sup>) "who is placed before" is, e.g. 1, 94, 6, used without and 1, 44, 10 with the complement *yajñesu*; *yāman-* "going, course" for "race-course" (112, 17); *bhaga-* "part, portion, allotment" for "Opferanteil" (G.) (116, 19); 2, 27, 2 *dhārapūta-* "pure as a stream of Soma"; *āhuta-* "offered as an oblation" means 3, 24, 3 etc. "sprinkled with ghee": 8, 19, 22 *ghṛtebhir āhutaḥ*; 10, 69, 1 *ghṛtenāhutaḥ* etc. Cf. also 5, 64, 7. In a similar way the verb *aj-* may mean "to drive to the race": 5, 30, 14 *atyo na vājī raghur ajyamānaḥ*. Not rarely a demonstrative pronoun suffices to indicate the hymn or the subject-matter of a stanza: 10, 111, 3 *indraḥ kila śrutya asya veda*; 97, 19.

Typically elliptical are, generally speaking, many terms which while expressing by themselves a rather general idea occur in a particular context in a specialized meaning. Professional or other communities with a well-developed and specialized sphere of common interests and an

<sup>24</sup>) Otherwise 10, 115, 8 *iti . . . vandate*.

<sup>25</sup>) Cf. e.g. E. Gamillscheg, *Französische Bedeutungslehre*, Tübingen 1951, p. 174f.

<sup>26</sup>) Cf. also Struck, o.c., p. 17.

<sup>27</sup>) For the meaning and history of which see my article in *Studia Indologica*, Festschrift-W. Kirfel, Bonn 1955, p. 107ff.

appropriate jargon are the ideal nursery of these shortenings. Cf. e.g. Fr. *chambre (des députés)*; Span. *lista (de platos)*; Eng. *flour < flour of wheat*, etc.<sup>28</sup>)

In instances such as the following a subordinated noun may be supposed to have been omitted: 2, 3, 2 *narāśaṃsaḥ prati dhāmāny añjan* which, in view of VājS. 20, 37 n. *prati śūro mimānas tanūnapāt prati yaññasya dhāma*, must mean "N. adorned (arranged) the institutions (sc. of the sacrifice)"; 1, 6, 8 *gaṇaiḥ* "with the troops or bodies (sc. of singers)"; 6, 66, 11 *divaḥ śardhāya*: 8, 20, 9 etc. *ś. marutāya* and 4, 3, 8 *ś. marutām*; 1, 43, 9 *nābhā* "in the navel (sc. of the world), i.e. the sacrificial ground"; 1, 95, 8 *budhnam* "lowest part of anything, base, bottom" (sc. of Agni), i.e. "Agni's underlayer"; probably also 3, 39, 3 *tapuḥ*<sup>29</sup> "blaze (of fire)". This is not to contend that all the 'complete expressions' must have existed; often there has probably never been any shortening proper, the situation allowing the monorheme to be so self-evident as to do without any explicit determination. Thus *anta-* "end" may have condensed into "edge, border", and even into (1, 37, 6) "hem". In 5, 45, 2 *orvād gavām mātā jānatī gāt* we may with G. supply: "(des Weges) kundig", although there is something to be said for S.'s *sūrya udeṣyati mayā ca vyucchanam kartavayam iti jānatī*. It is of course difficult to keep the more technical ellipses apart from those which were commonly used and became traditional. Among the latter is no doubt 2, 39, 3 *śṛṅgeva naḥ prathamā gantam arvāk* "wie die Hörner (des Tieres) gehet voran zu uns her". The condensed sense of a substantive may also appear in a derivative: 1, 51, 4 *adhārayaḥ parvate dānumad vasu* "du hieltest fest den Schatz der (Himmels)gabe in dem Berge".

It is sometimes difficult to decide which word has been omitted: according to G. 3, 31, 15 *sūryam uśasam gātum agnim* means, in view of 1, 71, 2 "sun, dawn, fire and 'den Wandel (der Himmelserscheinungen und den dadurch regulierten Zeit)'" ; as, however similar passages (7, 78, 3; 80, 2) have *yaññam* and 10, 1, 91 kh., 5 *gātum yaññāya* the gen. *yaññasya* seems to stand a better chance of being the missing term. Sometimes G.'s translations suggest an ellipsis of this type where there is none, e.g. 1, 65, 5 *puṣṭiḥ* "(Vermögens)zuwachs", rather "well-nourished condition, thriving, prosperity". Elsewhere there is in all probability no normal ellipsis, but one of those shortenings which are characteristic of this poetry: that in 1, 171, 5 *vyuṣṭiṣu . . . śasvatīnām* the noun *uśasām* should, with S., be tacitly added, is evident (*vy. uśasaḥ* does, it is true, occur). Similarly, 6, 12, 2 *taturuṣo na jaṃhaḥ*; 29, 1.

We should however be aware that in many cases there need not have been any ellipsis at all. More specialized acceptations of a much used word are apt to arise in certain recurrent contexts or situations; at first they

<sup>28</sup>) Other examples may be found in H. Hatzfeld, Leitfaden der vergl. Bedeutungslehre<sup>2</sup>, München 1928, p. 38ff. Cf. also K. Vossler, Geist und Kultur in der Sprache, Heidelberg 1925, p. 210f.

<sup>29</sup>) See Geldner, Rig-veda<sup>2</sup>, p. 382.



are no more than shifts or different shades of that word.<sup>30</sup>) That for instance a word for “drop” (*indu-*) should have been applied to the soma which when being purified drips is perfectly intelligible without the assumption that *somasya* has been omitted: G.’s “(Soma)säfte” (e.g. 9, 79, 2) is therefore somewhat deceptive. The noun *vahni-* which in general denoted “anyone who conveys or is borne along, whether as a charioteer or rider”, is also used for “the conveyer or bearer of the oblations” (cf. 1, 20, 8; 3, 5, 1 etc.); it often applied to Indra, the Ásvins and other gods, but in particular to Agni who conveys the oblations of men to the gods and conducts the latter to the sacrifices. Cf. also 1, 19, 4; 35, 4 (and 1, 112, 18). Elsewhere a semantic change may appear to have been effected by the well-known ‘shift’ from the impersonal to the personal sphere: the plural of *vāñi* “voice, sound, speech” is, e.g. 1, 119, 5 used in stating that the two Voices drove the chariot of the Ásvins. G.’s “Stimmen” (9, 104, 4) seems therefore preferable to his “(Sänger)stimmen” (8, 12, 22).<sup>31</sup>)

In no other field of linguistics it is more imperative to proceed with the utmost caution: the simple and straightforward appearance of ellipsis may prove superficial and deceptive. There are in the Veda amplified expressions which may occur beside single nouns,<sup>32</sup>) e.g. *vahnir āsā* (RV. 1, 76, 4 etc.), lit. “le conducteur par la parole” (Renou), i.e. “der Wortführer” (G.);<sup>33</sup>) the single *vahnih* is certainly no shortening of this phrase.

The above remarks about semantic specialization induce us briefly to discuss some other words which in all probability have, in their specialized use, not arisen from shortening. RV. 1, 71, 8 *abhika-* “meeting” for “(Liebes)begegnung” (G.) is a counterpart of our *coition, intercourse* etc.; the Skt. *saṅgama-* “meeting, intercourse” is also used for “sexual union”. 1, 89, 9 *madhyā . . . gantoh* “mitten auf dem (Lebens)weg” (G.): cf. our *career*; 1, 92, 21 *vrjanasya gopām* “den Hirten der (Opfer)pastei” (G.), whether this translation is exact or not, the original sense of *vrjana-* seems to have been more general: “circle, group of people associated and inhabiting a definite area”;<sup>34</sup>) cf. 2, 34, 7 etc.; 1, 126, 3 *ahan-* for “sacrificial day”; 140, 13 *dīrghāhā* for “lange (Lebens)tage” (G.); 1, 165, 4 etc. *adri-* “stone for pressing soma”; cf. the specialized use of Engl. *stone*: (*precious*) *stone*, (*plum*)*stone*, (*gall*)*stone* etc.; 1, 173, 3 *sadma* for “the places of sacrifice”; similarly 1, 181, 5 *sadanāni*; 1, 178, 4 *prakhādaḥ* for “destroyer (of enemies)”; 1, 184, 2 *ūrmi-* “the wave(s) of Soma”; *dhārā* “the gushes or jets of soma”;<sup>35</sup>) 2, 25, 1 and elsewhere *agni-* means the sacrificial fire: *indhāno agniṃ vanavad vanuṣyataḥ* “who kindles the fire will conquer the assailants” does not of course apply to the man who kindles a profane fire.

<sup>30</sup>) S. Ullmann, The principles of semantics, Glasgow 1951, p. 181 f.

<sup>31</sup>) See also Renou, *Ét. véd. et pāṇ.* I, p. 8.

<sup>32</sup>) See Renou, *Ét. véd. et pāṇ.* I, p. 54, n. 1.

<sup>33</sup>) Cf. also Geldner, o.c. I<sup>3</sup>, p. 7; 99.

<sup>34</sup>) See also Renou, *Ét. véd. et pāṇ.* III, p. 20.

<sup>35</sup>) Geldner, o.c., III, p. 9.

Like our "fracture" *visras-* stands 2, 39, 4 for "breaking of a bone or limb"; *apas-* "work" is 3, 12, 7 etc. used for "sacrificial act"; *dhātar-* "arranger, disposer" may also apply to sacrificial priests (4, 7, 1); *dhmātar-* "blower" is a "melter of metal" (5, 9, 5). Cf. also 3, 33, 1 *payas-*; 4, 26, 3 *mandasāna-* "intoxicated (by soma)"; 5, 12, 6 *prasarsrāṇa-* "extending, lasting" for "(in seinen Kindern) fortlebend". The noun *paridhi-* "enclosure, fence" was especially used for the 'enclosure' laid round a sacrificial fire: 1, 128, 1.

There are also examples of the phenomenon called bisemy, i.e. the dichotomy of a monosemantic sense-unit, in casu, specialization in two — or even more — different directions. The noun *sānu-* "surface, summit, ridge" is 9, 26, 5 used for the upper side of the soma strainer, which elsewhere is called *sānv avyayam*; 2, 3, 7 for the three "(Feuer)erhöhungen" (on the sacrificial ground); it denotes the surface of the earth as well as a mountain-top, and also (4, 27, 4) "the 'back' of the sky". Also *bhr̥ṣṭi-*: 4, 5, 3; and 2, 14, 9 *vane nipūtaṃ vana un mayadhvam* "schöpft den im Holz(gefäß) Geläuterten in den Holz(becher)!" (G.): cf. e.g. our *leather* for any of various things made of leather (strap; ball etc.). The specialized sense may of course also appear in derivatives: 4, 6, 3 *rātini* "mit der (Opfer)gabe" (G.). In cases such as 2, 21, 2 where *namaḥ* "adoration, homage" may be translated by "words of homage" (*nama indrāya vocata*) a word expresses, in a particular context, a special manifestation or realization of a general idea.

In addition to the above examples some remarks may be made on other bracketed words in Geldner's translation which might create the illusion that the original text is elliptical. In 1, 110, 1 *ayam samudra iha viśvadevyah* "hier ist das für die Allgötter bestimmte Meer (des Soma)" *samudrah* is, in my opinion, 'metaphorically' employed, not elliptically;<sup>36</sup> cf. e.g. also 9, 29, 3 *vardhā samudram*, where G. inconsistently, but more satisfactorily, relegates his explication to a special footnote; 9, 101, 6 etc. etc. Yet the term metaphor — usually applied to those cases of semantic change which while made possible by an association between the senses or sensuous impressions, result from the fact that there are some features in common between in casu a real sea and the soma contained in the large vessel (or this vessel itself) — should be used only with all proper reserve, because the ancient priests considered the celestial ocean and the soma vessel to be identical.<sup>37</sup> I for one am convinced that the German "freier Raum" and "Ausweg (aus der Not)" are not completely adequate 'equivalents' of an 'original' and a more or less metaphorical meaning of *varivas-* (4, 24, 2), or rather: whereas the German expressions are related to each other as proper sense and metaphor the ancient Indian word may express two or more context-bound nuances of one and the same 'vague concept' which is subject to semantic association and amplification.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Cf. also H. Grassmann, Wörterbuch zum Rig-veda (Leipzig 1936), 1483.

<sup>37</sup> I refer to H. Lüders, Varuṇa, I, Göttingen 1951, p. 268ff.

<sup>38</sup> For 1, 95, 3 dealt with as a metaphor by Geldner see my Four studies in the language of the Veda, 's-Gravenhage 1959, p. 81.

The word for "darkness" is like our "night", 1, 117, 17 used for "blindness": *tamaḥ praṇītam* "in die Nacht (der Blindheit) geführt" (G.): here the word used expresses in itself an idea that is closely associated with that for which it stands.<sup>39)</sup> Another instance of metonymy is the use of "cow" for "milk", e.g. 1, 121, 8, where G.'s "(Milch der) Kühe" should not suggest an ellipsis; cf. 134, 2. Cf. also 1, 190, 4 *dyūn* for "inhabitants of heaven"; *camasa-* "the vessel used for drinking soma" stands 1, 54, 9 for "the soma in this vessel". Semantic shifts such as "sheep" (*avi-*) for "the woollen soma-strainer" are traditionally called synecdoche: 9, 107, 8 *soma u ṣuvāṇaḥ . . . / adhi ṣṛubhir avinām* — but 9, 109, 7 we encounter a fine example of ellipsis: *pavasva soma . . . / mahām* (probably *sānum*) *avinām anu* —, the phrases *avyo vāra-* and *avyaya- vāra* for the sieve made of sheep's wool being frequent. Cf. also the synecdoche 1, 166, 10 *etāḥ* "antelopes" instead of "hides of these animals". Notwithstanding the occurrence of the *prthivī mātāḥ* the use of *mātāḥ* alone to indicate the earth is not, or not always, to be regarded as due to ellipsis (cf. e.g. 1, 140, 9; 159, 2), because goddesses and 'divine concepts' are also elsewhere (cf. e.g. 10, 35, 2) called "mothers".<sup>40)</sup>

No objection may however, generally speaking, be raised against omissions of a substantive in a phrase or a word group which in other parts of the Ṛgveda is given in full. The goddess Dawn, Uṣas, is frequently called *duhitar- divaḥ* "daughter of heavens" (e.g. 1, 30, 22; 1, 48, 8 she is *maghonī duhitā divaḥ*), but 1, 46, 1 *priyā divaḥ*; 3, 61, 6 *ṛtāvarī divaḥ*. In these phrases a subst. which is accompanied by an adj. and a dependent genitive has been left out.<sup>41)</sup> Similarly, 9, 71, 4 *dyukṣam* (sc. *sānum*) *sahasah*. Cf., in French, *la muette de Portici*. Possibly also 1, 86, 1 *divo vimahasah*; 73, 10 *rāyah sudhuraḥ*; 176, 2 *ekas carṣaṇinām* (cf. 1, 7, 9); 3, 27, 10 *dakṣasya . . . sahaskrta*; 4, 5, 12 *guhādhvānaḥ paramam* (sc. "end"); 5, 39, 2 *indra dyukṣam* ("Gabe", G.) *tad ā bhara*. The adj. *mandasāna-* "delighted, intoxicated" takes the loc. of the drink etc. in which one delights: 2, 11, 5; *ugreṣu m.* in st. 17 may therefore be considered an ellipsis: "an den starken (Somatränken) dich berauschend" (G.).

The frequent phrase *apām napāt* "(of Agni) son of the waters" (e.g. 1, 22, 6) is 3, 25, 5 probably for reasons of versification elliptically shortened: *agne apām sam idhyase*. Cf. 3, 27, 10. Instead of *janīma mānuṣānām* (7, 62, 1), *janīmā* alone: 4, 2, 17; cf. *bṛhat sāma* (e.g. 8, 98, 1): *bṛhat* 5, 25, 7 (cf. also 6, 4, 7 *māhi*). Cf. also 4, 1, 16. The phrase *devānām patnīḥ* 1, 22, 9 etc. is also shortened: 5, 41, 6 *patnīḥ*.

<sup>39)</sup> RV. 6, 11, 5 "Augenlicht" rather than "Augen(licht)" because *cakṣuḥ* means also "faculty of seeing; sight".

<sup>40)</sup> A transferred or widened meaning is sometimes marked by the addition of a demonstrative pronoun: 3, 8, 1 *yad vā kṣayo mātur asyā upasthe* "or when you will stay in the lap of this mother (i.e. rest in the bowels of this earth)".

<sup>41)</sup> For 1, 77, 3 cf. also Renou, Ét. véd. et pāṇ. I, p. 38.

A widespread ellipsis concerns “the use of a genitive case as a primary”:<sup>42)</sup> Engl. *I bought it at the butcher’s; St. Paul’s is a fine building.*<sup>43)</sup> That is to say: in frequent syntagmata consisting of a governing and a governed noun — which in the ancient I.-E. languages was in the genitive — the former is frequently omitted. Some examples are, in Latin, Ter. Ad. 582 *ad Dianae* (sc. *aedem, fanum*); C.I.L. 13, 1983 *vade in Apolinis* (sc. *balneis lavari*); in Greek, Z 47 *πολλὰ δ’ ἐν ἀφνειοῦ πατρὸς* (sc. *δώματι*) *κειμήλια κεῖται* “many treasures lie stored (in the palace) of my wealthy father”; Eur. I.A. 926 *ἐν ἀνδρὸς εὐσεβεστάτου* (sc. *δώματι*) *τραφεῖς*; O. Norse, *át Kareks, frá Gunnars* (sc. “house”), NHG. *zu Müllers; bei Müllers*; Engl. *at my aunt’s; Lyon’s*;<sup>44)</sup> in Dutch dialects (Brabant) *ik ga naar Gradje’s* (sc. *house, café*), etc. This frequent omission of terms for “house, family etc.” is no doubt rooted “in umgangssprachlichem Abkürzungsverfahren”.<sup>45)</sup> Similar are, in Latin, the ellipses of *tempore, diebus*,<sup>46)</sup> of words for “town, field” and names of holy-days in Slavonic languages.<sup>47)</sup>

As noticed by Delbrück<sup>48)</sup> *gr̥ha-* “house” or *prajā-* “family” are sometimes in a similar way to be supplied in Vedic texts: ŚB. 14, 9, 1, 7 (= BĀU. 6, 2, 4) *sa ā jagāma gautamo yatra pravāhaṇasya jaivaler āsa* lit. “so G. went forth to where (the place) of P.J. was”, i.e. “G. . . to the place of P.J.”. A later example is Kāl. Pur. 2, 3, 104 *dhyānasthasya vasiṣṭhasya devaiḥ saha jagāma ha*. Whereas 1, 100, 13 *divo na tveṣo ravataḥ śimīvān*, which was already by S. interpreted as a shortening (*divaḥ sambandhī sūrya iva*), is rather a case of sous-entendu or ἀπό κοινοῦ: “wie des Himmels (Donner) ist sein Geschrei, heftig, wütig”; *rava-* is also used of thunder; *ru-*, *rauti* denote the making of any sound and noise — cf. also 1, 122, 8 *asya stuṣe mahi maghasya rādhaḥ | sacā sanema nahuṣaḥ (rādhaḥ) swivrah (tvaddattam dhanam sambhajema labhemahi S.)*; 1, 165, 6 *viśvasya śatoror (vadham) anamaṇ vadhasnaih*; 1, 46, 9 —, 1, 180, 2 may be quoted as an example in point: *yuvam atyasyāva naksatho yad* for “(the fastness) of the race-horse”; cf. 1, 51, 10 *ā tvā vātasya* (“horses”) . . . *manoyuja . . . avahan* (where however an adj. is added) and also 2, 24, 10 *vibhu prabhu . . . mehanāvataḥ (rādhaḥ)*. Yet it may be asked if the term ellipsis is applicable without reserve; 2, 13, 9 is anyhow to be considered a harsh instance of breviloquentia: *suprāvyo abhavaḥ* “du wardst (der Helfer) des gut “Zuredenden” (G.).

<sup>42)</sup> Avestan parallels: H. Reichelt, *Awest. Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg 1909, § 719.

<sup>43)</sup> O. Jespersen, *The Philosophy of grammar*, ed. 1935, p. 98.

<sup>44)</sup> For a collection of examples see A. E. H. Swaen, *Festschrift Jespersen*, Copenhagen 1930, p. 275ff.

<sup>45)</sup> (M. Leumann-) J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Grammatik*, München 1928, p. 393f.; B. Maurenbrecher, in *Festgabe W. Streitberg*, Leipzig 1924, p. 236.

<sup>46)</sup> See E. Löfstedt, *Philol. Kommentar zur Peregr. Aetheriae*, Uppsala-Leipzig 1911, p. 301f.

<sup>47)</sup> See W. Vondrák, *Vergl. Slavische Grammatik*, II, Göttingen 1928, p. 232; 574.

<sup>48)</sup> B. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, Halle a.S. 1888, p. 9. See also J. S. Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, Strassburg 1896, p. 18, § 64.

According to Renou<sup>49</sup>) in 3, 34, 3 *pra māyīnām amināt* the addition of the accusative of the substantive “(aurait) risqué de rompre l’harmonie phonique”. However, the word wanting could hardly have been any other than *māyāḥ*, so that the conclusion seems warranted that here again the poet, probably haplogically and for metrical convenience, adopted a scheme which in principle was not foreign to the general language.

Other examples are: 3, 1, 2 *divaḥ śaśāsūr vidathā kavīnām (dyulokād āgatya devaḥ, S.)*; 19, 3 (according to G.) *śikṣa svapatyasya śikṣoḥ (sv. i.e. rāyaḥ sv., cf. 2, 2, 12 rāyaḥ . . . svapatyasya)*; <sup>50</sup>) 4, 16, 11 *todo vātasya* (‘persona pro re’); 5, 41, 20 *siṣaktu na ūrjavyasya puṣṭeḥ*; 75, 4 *suṣṭubho (sc. vāk) . . . āhitā*; 6, 7, 4 *yat pitror adīdeḥ* (cf., in 5 *pitror upasthe*)<sup>51</sup>). In ṚV. 5, 42, 5 S. may be right: *indro vṛtrasya (sc. hantā) samjīto dhanānām*, or *samjīt-* should in the sing. nom. be connected also with *vṛtrasya* (haplogy or a type of ἀπό κοινού). ṚV. 5, 71, 3 is a type of sous-entendu.

Sometimes the nominal idea is vaguely indicated by a pronoun: 1, 52, 5 and 14 *māde asya (sc. somasya) yudhyataḥ*: for the complete expression see e.g. 1, 85, 10; 1, 56, 1; 102, 1 *asya (sc. stotuḥ), stotre*; 9, 69, 1 *asya vrataṣu*; 1, 164, 18; 10, 31, 5 (an objective gen.) *asya (agneḥ) stutim*. One might recall the use of a pronoun in 8, 2, 41 *śikṣā . . . asmai* (viz. the singer).<sup>52</sup>) For a similar use of a word for “all”: 3, 56, 3.

Under this heading belong also the instances of ellipsis of “son, daughter etc.”: in Greek, Hdt. 3, 88 *Δαγεῖος ὁ Ὑστράσπεος* “D. (the son) of H.”; in Dutch *Piet van Mina* “P. (sc. son) of M.”. It is, however, in my opinion doubtful whether the relevant examples must be integrally considered elliptical. Since women and girls speak of *mijn Jan* “my John” or *mijn Piet* “my Peter” — for instance in order to distinguish these men from “your John” and “your Peter” —, in the same way as they say *mijn man* “my husband”, so a filial relation is often doubtless viewed as possessive: *mijn Pietje* like “my baby”. Whatever the explication may be, there are some Vedic instances: 8, 1, 32 *āsaṅgasya svanadrathaḥ* “S. (the son) of Ā.”; 6, 47, 22 *divodāsād atithigvasya*.<sup>53</sup>) ṚV. 1, 181, 4 is a case of sous-entendu: *jiṣṇur vām anyāḥ sumakhasya sūrīr | divo anyāḥ subhagaḥ putra ūhe*.<sup>54</sup>) Cf. also 5, 59, 8 *rudrasya marutaḥ* and 7, 58, 5 *tān tān . . . rudrasya* as compared to 1, 85, 1 and 6, 50, 4 *rudrasya sūnavāḥ*; the ‘complete’ expression *maruto rudrasya sūnavāḥ* does not, however, occur. ṚV. 1, 147, 1

<sup>49</sup>) Renou, *Ét. véd. et pāṇ.* I, p. 36.

<sup>50</sup>) For 3, 25, 2 and 34, 2 see Four studies in the language of the Veda, ’s-Gravenhage 1959, p. 75. ṚV. 4, 17, 2 is a case of sous-entendu.

<sup>51</sup>) For 6, 12, 3 cf. Geldner, o.c., II, p. 104; 6, 19, 5 gen. ‘qualitatis’??

<sup>52</sup>) Cf. Geldner, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 132.

<sup>53</sup>) If D. and A. are, in this passage, two distinct persons; see e.g. A. B. Keith, in the Cambridge History of India, I, 1922, p. 101; F. E. Pargiter, Ancient Indian historical tradition, London 1922, p. 116; A. D. Pusalker, Aryan settlements in India, in R. C. Majumdar and A. D. Pusalker, The history and culture of the Indian people, I, London 1951, p. 246.

<sup>54</sup>) See however Geldner, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 261.

*kathā te agne śucayanta āyor | dadāśur . . . āśuṣānāḥ* “wie haben dir, A., (die Söhne) des Agni inbrünstig sich beeifernd . . . aufgewartet” (Geldner)<sup>55</sup> is dubious.<sup>56</sup>

One of the most common types of ellipsis, which moreover is apt to petrify, consists in the omission of the substantive of a frequent substantive adjective phrase. Very often indeed an adjective which often, in the same or similar situations, accompanies a substantive, assumes the sense of the whole combination. Thus a (*malum*) *Persicum* was the Latin name for “peach”: hence the Dutch *perzik* etc.; *ad confluentem* (sc. *fluvium*); *brevissima* (sc. *dies*) > *bruma* “the winter solstice, the winter time”; (*domus*) *cathedralis* > Fr. *cathédrale*; Eng. *weekly* < *weekly (news)paper*; (*lac*) *formaticum* > Fr. *fromage*, etc.<sup>57</sup> R̥gvedic examples are numerous, but it is far from clear, how far individual cases were usual or petrified. Here lies one of the difficulties in studying this phenomenon: viz. the problem how to decide whether these ‘shorter expressions’ had, for the author and his audience, lost any connection with their origin, whether a particular case of ‘adj. instead of adj. + subst.’ was ‘fresh’ or traditional. In view of the complete phrase *mānuṣa yugā(ni)* “the human generations” (1, 103, 4; 144, 4 etc.) *mānuṣā* alone in 1, 51, 1 *yasya dyāvo na vicaranti mānuṣā* must be considered an ellipsis. In passages such as 1, 37, 1 *mānuṣaḥ* “man, human being” is a petrified ellipsis and substantivized adjective.<sup>58</sup>

An indication of the petrified nature of a word which may be considered to owe its existence, as a substantive, to ellipsis lies in the possibility of qualifying it by means of adjectives: the word *rohita* -1) “red”, 2) “a red or chestnut horse” is 3, 6, 6 accompanied by *keśin-* “having long manes” and *ghṛtasnu-* “dropping ghee”; *hari-* “brown, bay; bay steed” by *āsu-*, *aḥira-*, *vacoyuj-* and many other adjectives; *sutaḥ* “(what has been pressed out,) soma” is 10, 27, 2 called *tivra-*; 7, 67, 4 it reads *suṣutā madhūni*; *madhu* which may denote the soma juice is 9, 1, 8 described as *tridhātu vāraṇam*; 9, 98, 7 likewise in connection with soma: *haryataṃ harim babhrum*.

Some other examples of ellipsis proper are, or seem to be, the following: 1, 51, 12 *vṛṣapāṇeṣu*: 1, 139, 6 *vṛṣapāṇāsa indavaḥ*; 1, 54, 9 *camūśadaḥ*: 10, 43, 4 *somāsaḥ . . . camūśadaḥ* “the soma juices which are poured into the camū vessel”; 1, 61, 7 *pacatam* “cooked food” (also 10, 116, 8): 3, 28, 2 *purolā . . . pacataḥ*; <sup>59</sup> 1, 82, 5 *yuktas te astu dakṣiṇa | uta savyaḥ . . .* (sc. *hari-*, *aśva-*); 1, 105, 15 *navyas* “ein neues (Lied)” (G.): cf. 10, 89, 3 *brahma navyam*; 9, 91, 5 *navyase . . . sūktāya* etc.; 1, 126, 5 *yuktān* “bespannte (Wagen)” (G.): 8, 25, 22 *rathaṃ yuktam*.

<sup>55</sup>) See also the note by the same, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 205.

<sup>56</sup>) See H. W. Bailey, in B.S.O.A.S. 20 (London 1957), p. 41ff.

<sup>57</sup>) Cf. also H. Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*<sup>5</sup>, Halle a.S. 1920, p. 322; S. Ullmann, *The principles of semantics*, Glasgow 1951, p. 116; 239.

<sup>58</sup>) I refer to J. Wackernagel-A. Debrunner, *Altindische Grammatik* II, 2, Göttingen 1954, p. 129ff.

<sup>59</sup>) For the adj. suffix *-ata-* see Wackernagel-Debrunner, o.c., II, 2, p. 168.



The well-known and very frequent 'use of an adj. instead of an adj.-subst. group' was for Sanskrit already noticed by Speyer,<sup>60)</sup> who added the observation that the substantivizing of adjectives may also result from their having received some special meaning: e.g. *hari-* adj. "brown", subst. masc. "lion, monkey etc."

Often there is indeed no ellipsis or omission at all. In 1, 12, 4 *tān usato vi bodhaya*, wrongly translated "ermuntere die verlangenden Götter" (G.) *tān* refers to *devān* in 3 and *usataḥ* is an appositional participle: "arouse the gods who are eager"; cf. also 2, 37, 6 etc. In 1, 111, 3 I would prefer connecting *sakṣaṇim* with *sātim*; in 121, 5 *śuci* belongs to *payah* in pāda a; 1, 183, 2 why should we insert, with G., "driver"? : *yat tiṣṭhataḥ kratumantā* . . . , not "wenn ihr als umsichtige . . . steht", but "when you are standing skilfully", *kr.* being 'verbalappositif'; sentences such as 10, 21, 3 are intelligible as they are; in 3, 14, 7 *suratha-* is used in a specialized sense; in 3, 50, 2 the subst. is sous-entendu; in 4, 7, 2 *īḍyam* needs no complement; even 3, 54, 14 may be complete in itself; 1, 95, 10 the absence of "wood, plants" is due to sous-entendu rather than ellipsis. In cases such as 1, 51, 12 *indra yathā sutasomeṣu cākanaḥ* I would not follow G. in translating: "so wie du, I., an den somapressenden (Menschen) deine Freude hast", because the *bahuvrīhi* compound may become substantivized without passing through an 'elliptic stage'.<sup>61)</sup> Especially in combinations such as 1, 3, 3; 142, 1 this character of the compounds seems to be evident.

With regard to the substantivized adjectives in general we should subscribe to the opinion pronounced by Schwyzer and Debrunner:<sup>62)</sup> "Teils schwebt dabei der allgemeine Begriff einer Person (Mann, Frau) oder Sache vor, teils ist die Bezeichnung eines speziellen Sachbegriffes unterdrückt (Ellipse)". Both categories should indeed be regarded as fundamentally distinct. Under the first head one could range, e.g., in Homer ε 213 *θηγάς ἀθανάτησι* "mortal women . . ."; I 319 *ἡμὲν κακὸς ἦδὲ καὶ ἐσθλός*, in Latin, Ter. Heaut. 20 *bonorum exemplum* "the precedent of good writers", *sapiens* "a judicious or wise man, a sage" etc., and in the RV., 1, 79, 1 *yaśasvatīr apasyuvo na satyaḥ* "ehrbar wie fleiszige treue Frauen" rather than, with G., ". . . (F.)" — here the feminine is obligatory (cf. e.g. also 2, 13, 1; 3, 1, 11); in general it is rare, because the masculine often includes the female sex —; 81, 9 *viśvam . . . vāryam* "allen Begehrenswerten" rather than, with G., "a. b. (Besitz)", cf. in Greek, A 107 *τὰ κάκα; τὸ καλόν; τὸ ἵπικόν* "the cavalry".<sup>63)</sup> Here the quality denoted by the adjective is transferred to a person or an object, which are exclusively viewed as characterized by that quality. When in Latin a woman is called *femina*, lit. "the nursing one" one of her many aspects and qualities is,

<sup>60)</sup> J. S. Speyer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, Leiden 1886, p. 179f.

<sup>61)</sup> Cf. *Epithets in the R̥gveda*, 's-Gravenhage 1959, p. 20ff.

<sup>62)</sup> E. Schwyzer–A. Debrunner, *Griech. Grammatik*, II, München 1950, p. 174.

<sup>63)</sup> For Latin gerundives used as substantives see (M. Leumann)–J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Grammatik*, München 1928, p. 458; cf. also p. 454 f.

to the exclusion of the others, emphasized. The adj. becomes a subst. "toutes les fois que la qualité générale exprimée par l'adj. est rapportée à un individu particulier, c'est-à-dire toutes les fois que d'indéterminé — ce qu'il est par nature — l'adj. devient déterminé".<sup>64</sup>) Other adjectives which already at an early date could fulfil both functions ("zwischen substantivischer und adjektivischer Geltung schwankten"<sup>65</sup>) are: 1, 82, 2 *priyāḥ* for "the friends": cf. in Greek *φίλος* "beloved, dear" and "friend"; Lat. *amicus* "friendly, kind; friend"; the Engl. *friend* originally was a pres. participle<sup>66</sup>); the fem. *priyā* is "fast substantivisch: die Geliebte",<sup>67</sup>) cf. the Germ. *Geliebte*, Eng. *beloved*; *deva-* and *devī-* "celestial, divine" and "god, goddess"; *anya-* "the other", cf. *οἱ ἄλλοι* "(all the others)"; *martya-* "mortal" and (R.V. in a large majority of occurrences) "a mortal, men", cf. Lat. *mortalis* "subject to death, human; a mortal, a man". Thus 2, 3, 3 we could translate *mānuṣa-* by "human being, man [viz. the Hotar]". The word for "many" can also act as a substantive: 3, 7, 9 *vṛṣāyante mahe atyāye pūrvīḥ* "für den groszen Hengst geraten die vielen (Stuten) in Brunst" (G.): cf. e.g. Gr. *οἱ πολλοί* "the many, the greater number, the people"; *mahāni* could as a subst. denote "Grosztaten" (3, 34, 6). The adj. *revat* "wealthy" stands for "wealth" (1, 95, 11 etc.). In 6, 22, 8 *pārthivāni* and *divyāni* are on a par with *antarikṣā*. The word *vanus-* is adj. "eager, zealous" as well as subst.: "devotee, adorer". The verbal adj. *vitatam* occurs for "texture" (1, 115, 4). An epithet like *puruḥūta-* "much invoked" does not need when translating the addition "Indra" (G. 3, 54, 17). Cf. also 2, 26, 1 *duṣṭara-*; 6, 13, 2 *parijman-*, etc. etc.

In discussing the phenomena under consideration when occurring in ancient texts of a hieratic character it will however not always be possible clearly to distinguish between ellipsis proper and substantivation.

Although, at first sight some shortened expressions occurring in connection with soma may appear to be elliptic, they may be due to substantivation as well: e.g. the use of *śukra-* "bright, light-coloured" instead of *śukra- + soma-*: 1, 84, 4; 2, 41, 2; that of *suta-* "pressed out" instead of the pressed soma: 1, 2, 4; 5; 56, 6; 108, 13; 5, 51, 1 etc.; of *mandin-* "exhilarating" for the same: 1, 121, 12; of *madīra-* "intoxicating": 1, 166, 7; cf. also 2, 41, 14 etc. The adj. *pūta-* "purified" occurs 5, 44, 9 instead of "the purified soma" in the compound *pūtabandhanī*. That in these texts the word for "drink; draught" is often left out is perfectly intelligible: 1, 10, 1 *svāhākr̥tasya* (sc. *somasya*) "consecrated with svāhā"; 1, 180, 1. *Somya-* is however elliptically used instead of "the soma draught": 1, 105, 3; cf. also the phrases *somyam madhu* (1, 14, 10; 19, 9 etc.) and *somyo rasaḥ* (9, 67, 8); *somya-* alone occurs also 3, 48, 1. In 2, 14, 8 the

<sup>64</sup>) J. Vendryes, *Le langage*, Paris 1921, p. 155.

<sup>65</sup>) Hofmann, o.c., p. 455.

<sup>66</sup>) Cf. M. Scheller, *Vedisch priyā- und die Wortsippe Frei, Freier, Freund*, Göttingen-Zürich 1929.

<sup>67</sup>) H. Grassmann, *Wörterbuch zum Rig-veda*, 889.



compound *gabhastipūtam* implies the idea of soma: “(the draught which is) purified with the hands”. Cf. also 1, 134, 5.

Adjectives indicating a colour are in many languages used instead of animals’ names: 1, 117, 8 *ruśatim* “white (sc. the cow)”. Sometimes however the adjective came to be the usual expression to such a degree that we are in uncertainty as to the noun to be supplied; thus the spotted or speckled animals ridden by the Maruts are briefly called *prṣatīh*; in accordance with the later usage the word may have referred to gazelles or antelopes (e.g. 2, 34, 3). Names of metals may also be omitted: 2, 41, 9 *piśaṅga-* “reddish” for “gold”.

An adjective which is etymologically related to a verb which while taking a particular object often helps to form phrases of specialized meaning may by itself express that meaning: *pratarāṇi-* in 1, 91, 19 *gayasphānaḥ pratarāṇaḥ suvīraḥ*.

In cases such as 1, 132, 2 where *uśarbudh-* “early-wakening”, which occurs also elsewhere as an epithet of the god of fire (1, 127, 10), is used alone, no ellipsis should be assumed: <sup>67a</sup>) in 1, 65, 9 also G. has “der Frühwache”; cf. 5, 64, 3 where Mitra need not be supplied; in 3, 6, 3 *yajñīyāsah* and 6, 41, 1 *prathamō yajñīyānām* etc. the adj. may have undergone an early substantivation. In 6, 16, 4 (*yajñīyam*) the god of the hymn, Agni, is of course referred to. Similar cases are probably not infrequent: 5, 6, 3 *sa prīto yāti vāryam*, where G. supplies “Gut”; 16, 5; 6, 25, 5 *viśvā jātāni* for “all (sc. beings) born”; 1, 23, 16 *adhvarīyatām* “of the officiants”; 1, 51, 12 *sutasomeṣu* “those who press soma”. Instances such as 6, 6, 4 *adhi sānu prṣneḥ* (see above) may also be explained as “on the surface of the spotted one” rather than “. . . of the spotted (sc. earth)”, because these veiled phrases were much in vogue. The poet of 1, 72, 10 may for instance be suspected to have aimed at a certain degree of enigmatic obscurity in order to suggest rather than specify the potencies about which he speaks: *adha kṣaranti sindhavo na sṛṣṭāḥ | pra nīcīr agne aruṣīr ajānan* “. . . die abwärts fließenden (Schmalzgüsse?) fanden den Weg zu den rötlichen (Flammen), o Agni” (G.).

It is however difficult to decide how far these poets drew on colloquial usage, or how far they deviated from speech habits of the general public, how far also they created new expressions. Instances such as 1, 125, 5 *tasmā iyaṃ dakṣiṇā pīnvate sadā* “ihm wird dieser Sängerlohn immerdar zur milchstrotzenden (Kuh)” (G.) belong in my opinion to their ‘Sondersprache’. RV. 1, 164, 17 *avaḥ pareṇa para enāvareṇa* . . . is, at least in this form, no doubt a product of sophistication, although the elements of this statement, like *ye arvāñcaḥ* and *ye parāñcaḥ* “those advancing” and “those retiring” in stanza 19 may have belonged to the general vocabulary.

Sometimes the omission of the subst. may be due to a tendency to ‘mystical or enigmatical brevity’: 1, 95, 1 *dve virūpe* (cows) *carataḥ* (how-

<sup>67a</sup>) Epithets in the R̥gveda, p. 94.

ever, *vatsam upa dhāpayete* in the next pāda solves the riddle); 164, 12; 15; 22; 3, 44, 1; 10, 1, 3; 1, 3, 4 the adj. *aṅvībhīḥ* alone refers to the small fingers of those who press soma; the feminine *adevīḥ* 6, 25, 9 no doubt refers to the godless communities (*viśaḥ*); *pārvābhīḥ* 1, 104, 4 to a word for “day”; *urvīḥ* 6, 47, 3 to worlds (*dyuprthivyādyāḥ* S.), the parts of the universe being often called “wide” or “broad”; cf. 6, 6, 2: as is well known, *urvī* is a usual term for “the earth”, e.g. 1, 146, 2; *vaśrā* e.g. 2, 34, 15: “the lowing (cow)”; — to a predilection for sharp antithesis: 1, 174, 8 *sanā tā ta indra navyā āguḥ*, or for concise formulations by means of paronomastic combinations: 6, 18, 4 *ugram ugrasya* “gewaltige (Macht)” (G.); 6, 39, 4; 3, 55, 7; or to a felicitous characterization which needs no completeness: 1, 121, 6 *sveduhavya-* “offering their sweat, i.e. toiling”, probably a more or less current expression (cf. 1, 173, 2). In 1, 4, 7 *āsum (somam) āsave (indrāya)* the qualities which the god and the draught have in common are emphasized. Occasionally the brevity seems to have been favourable to the creation of a ‘double entente’: 2, 10, 3 is no doubt ambiguous: *agniḥ purupeśāsu garbhaḥ* “A. became the embryo in the (pieces of wood) of many forms, colours etc.”, women wearing clothes which may be called also *purupeśa-*.<sup>68</sup>

Sometimes the adjectival character of a word might be defended by assuming a parenthesis: 3, 54, 10 *ṛdūdaraḥ śṛṇavan . . .* / — *m. s. v. y. — ādityāsaḥ . . .*

There are of course also dubious occurrences. Is for instance 1, 105, 10 (16) *pravācyam* elliptic (cf. 2, 22, 4) or merely substantivized “something praiseworthy or glorious”?

Some other typical and remarkable instances of ellipsis or substantivation may be subjoined here. The word “name” is according to G. omitted in 1, 104, 6: *indriya-* “(the name of) Indra”: *śraddhitam te mahata indriyāya* “man hat deinem groszen indrischen (Namen) vertraut” (G.); *indriya-* being a general term for the god’s characteristic qualities and the name being a true indication and expression of his essence and character and an essential part of his personality, the term *nāman-* understood in this sense may indeed be ‘supplied’. Cf. also 4, 24, 5. The adj. “brown” stands for the brown wood over which Agni bends 1, 140, 6; similarly, 2, 10, 3 *agniḥ purupeśāsu garbhaḥ*. The adj. “red” indicates Agni’s flames (1, 146, 2). Another evident case of demi mot suffit is 1, 140, 7 “as a friend he lies with those (fem.) who are his friends as their own (sc. husband)”. The word for “both” and “united” convey the idea of heaven and earth, the two components of the universe: 2, 27, 15; 1, 69, 1. Cf. also 1, 52, 13 *brhataḥ patiḥ* “lord, ruler of the firm (heavens)”; 79, 3 *uparasya yonau*; 123, 7 *parikṣitas tamaḥ*. The occurrence of what would seem to us to be unusual instances of ellipsis may often be explained from the frequent repetition of the same descriptions and the repeated allusion to the same

<sup>68</sup>) See also Renou, *Ét. véd. et pāṇ.*, I, p. 38f.

or similar situations, events or phenomena; thus e.g. 3, 30, 8 *tavāsā* instead of the powerful weapon of Indra; 1, 100, 3.

It is however not always easy to decide which substantive should be 'supplied'. Sometimes there are two possibilities: 1, 156, 4 *mārutasya* (sc. *gaṇasya* or *śardhasaḥ*).<sup>69</sup> In 6, 6, 2 S. interpreted *purūṇi pṛthūni* as *sthūlāni kāṣṭhāni*, Bhaṭṭabhāskaramiśra as *vistīrṇāni purodāsādīni havīṃsi*, G. as "die vielen, breiten (Flächen)". In other cases the 'vague' sense of the adj. might have sufficed. In 1, 112, 3 *divyasya praśāsane* Geldner translates "auf Geheisz des himmlischen (Geschlechts)", why not: "des Himmlichen"? Cf. also 1, 128, 3 *pārthivam* "all that belongs to the earth" ("Raum" G.); 1, 144, 6; 1, 44, 5 *viśvasya bhojana* "feeder of the universe". In 6, 45, 9 *dr̥ḥāni* may refer to "die festen Behälter, Schätze oder Burgen" of the enemies (G.), but also, in general, to anything strong or solid; in 1, 36, 8 *uru* may mean "something broad", i.e. "a wide region". The word *tridhātu* "the triple world" (1, 154, 4) probably is a simple substantivation, the adj. meaning "threefold".

Sometimes the noun to be supplied is more or less a guess: 1, 180, 5 where G. adds (*ūtiḥ*) "Hilfe" zu *māhinā* "mighty" used in connection with the Aśvins; 1, 30, 13 *revatiḥ* (sc. possessions?). Elsewhere however I would hesitate to supply, with G., a noun, e.g. 1, 128, 4 "(Priester)" to *purohitāḥ*. Why should we add, with G., the explication "Tag und Nacht" in translating 1, 158, 4 "nicht sollen mich diese beiden beflügelten ausmergeln"? For other places where one might be in doubt as to the word omitted see Geldner's notes on 1, 110, 5; 2, 33, 14; 7, 3, 8. Parallel passages may however be instructive: thus 6, 8, 5 *vidathyam* is elucidated by 1, 91, 20 and 7, 36, 8 where it accompanies *vīram*. As the adj. *vacoyujā* is not rarely added to *hari* "(Indra's) bay steeds" the suggestion to supply *rathena* is, in 1, 7, 2, improbable.

In other cases the context leaves no doubt as to the general sense of the noun which is to be supplied: 1, 114, 10 *goghnam* "killing kine" applies of course to a weapon; 1, 125, 5 *pinvate* (sc. cow); 1, 130, 8 *dakṣat* (sc. fire); 1, 142, 6 "like a terrible (sc. buffalo) he shakes his horns"; 5, 85, 8.

A nominal concept may be easily supplied in a passage including its opposite: 1, 25, 3 *vi mṛlīkāya te mano . . . śimahi* "wir möchten . . . deinen Sinn (vom Groll) losmachen zur Barmherzigkeit" (G.); 1, 61, 7.

Sometimes two adjectives are in this way used in the same text so as to form a pair of opposites: 1, 113, 2 *śvetyā*, sc. Dawn and *kṛṣṇā*, sc. Night; 1, 144, 6 *divyasya . . . pārthivasya*. Here belongs also 1, 164, 30 *amartyo martyenā sayoniḥ*; although the opposition of 'soul' and 'body' is obviously meant (see also G.), no substantives are needed, or perhaps we should say: the mystery could better be described without them. Cf. also 5, 15, 2 *jātaiḥ ajātāṃ abhi ye nanakṣuḥ* where G.'s addition "Söhnen" is superfluous.

<sup>69</sup>) For 3, 38, 3 see Geldner, *RV. übersetzt*, I<sup>2</sup>, p. 379; for 6, 3, 6 the same, II, p. 95.

These juxtapositions are a favourite means of emphasizing contrasts and the omission of substantives no doubt substantially added to the pointedness and 'mystic' value of these expressions: cf. 6, 17, 6 *āmāsu pakvaṃ . . . ni dīdhah*; of course G.'s "hast du . . . die gekochte (Milch) in die rohen (Kühe) gelegt" is meant, but I for one am not sure whether an ellipsis proper was 'intended' by the poet. Cf. also 4, 3, 9, etc.<sup>70</sup>) In 1, 115, 2 G.'s supplementation "(Tun)" is unnecessary: although the adjectives apply to different nominal concepts both of them may be described as something "auspicious": *prati bhadrāya bhadram* (sc. *yugam*).

In 1, 162, 7 and similar cases the addition of the substantive was unnecessary because the adjective is an epithet referring to, or recalling, the nominal concept on which attention is being focussed: *vitapṛsthah* "straight-backed" is the horse to which the *sūkta* is dedicated. Cf. also 1, 22, 17 *padam* / . . . *pāmsure* (sc. *pade*); 6, 17, 12; 25, 6 where *vyacasvantā* "zwei ausgedehnte (Völkerschaften", G.) refers to *ubhayoh*.

A more special nominal sense determining the general meaning of the adjective may indeed be supplied from another word occurring in the same sentence: 6, 16, 20 *sa hi viśvāti pārthivā rayim dāśan* ". . . Reichtum über alle irdischen (Schätze) hinaus"; 6, 6, 7 where *rayim* in c may be supplied in a and b; 1, 33, 11 where after the communication that the waters flowed the adj. *nāvyanām* "navigable" requires the noun "waters" or "river"; 6, 47, 8. Cf. also 1, 32, 7; 33, 6.

There are of course remarkable complications, for instance 1, 127, 5 *avo vyanto ajarā agnayo vyanto ajarāḥ*, where the first *ajarāḥ* is not accompanied by a noun (sc. "Flammen", G.); elsewhere also *ajara-* alone stands for Agni or fire (e.g. 6, 68, 9), or for his flames (1, 143, 1; 3, 18, 2); the expression was stereotyped. Cf. also 6, 16, 45 *ud . . . dyumad ajasreṇa davidyutat*, where *aj.* of course stands for the inextinguishable flame of the god; 6, 6, 7 *candrābhīḥ* (sc. Agni's flames). According to G. *tam aghāt . . . rakṣatā* and *pāthanā śamsāt* in 1, 166, 8 means *a.* (sc. *śamsāt*) and *ś.* (sc. *aghāt*); however S. may be right: *a.* = *pāpāt*.

Instances such as 3, 8, 10 *śṛṅgāṇivec chrṅgiṇām* "like the horns of those who have horns" the idea of "animals" is of course mentally to be supplied; but has it ever been a necessity?

In a considerable frequency of cases it is not only an adjective, but also the verb of the sentence — nay the whole context — which cooperates to make a passage in which an important substantive is wanting perfectly intelligible. The Roman author Tertullianus who attempted to avoid redundancies<sup>71</sup>) wrote (Scorp. 12) *albam* (sc. *vestem*) *vestiri* "to be dressed in white". 1, 49, 1 *uṣo bhadrebhīr ā gahi* / *dīvaś cid rocanād adhi* "O U. do thou

<sup>70</sup>) Renou, *Ét. véd. et pān.* I, p. 37 seems to go too far in saying that this allusion "fait partie intégrante du rébus". I would prefer: 'esoteric brevity'.

<sup>71</sup>) See H. Hoppe, *Beiträge zur Sprache und Kritik Tertullians*, Lund, 1932, p. 143.

with thine auspicious (rays) come even from the bright firmament"; 1, 28, 8; 51, 11; 53, 9; 55, 4; 61, 6; 85, 3; 93, 10; 139, 8; 165, 5; 2, 25, 4. R̥V. 1, 59, 7 the effect of the alliterative combination *śātavaneye śatinībhiḥ* is enhanced by the absence of a noun which however may be supplied as soon as the verb *jarate* is understood. Since lightning is the smile of the clouds (2, 4, 6) 1, 79, 2 *smayamanābhir aḡāt* means "(Agni) has come together with the smiling ones (i.e. flashes of lightning)". Cf. also 3, 60, 5 *samukṣitam sutam somam*; 3, 62, 2 *ayam . . . avase jōhavīti*; 2, 30, 9 *taṃ tigiteṇa* (sc. *tikṣṇe-nāyudhena*, S.) *vidha*; 35, 8 *yo . . . ā śucinā daivyeṇa* (sc. *devasambandhinā tejasā*, S.) . . . *vibhāti*; 14 *adhvasambhiḥ* (sc. *dhvaṃsanarahitais tejōbhiḥ*, S.); 4, 2, 2; 5, 6, 4; 6, 1, 10; 9, 86, 4.

It would be unreasonable to deny that part of these instances also do not exceed the possibilities of normal usage. R̥V. 2, 38, 4 e.g. *punaḥ avyad vitataṃ vayanti* "die Webende hat das ausgebreitete (Gewebe) wieder zugedeckt" is perfectly intelligible without the substantive, the more so as the verbs *tan-*, *vi-tan-* and their derivatives are often used in connection with weaving. Cf. also 1, 116, 9 *sahasrāya tṛṣyate gotamasya*; 1, 168, 4; 3, 14, 2; 5, 43, 3; 47, 1; 6, 26, 6. Nor should we forget that context and situation often made precise indications superfluous: 2, 3, 4; 14, 2; 20, 7.

The influence of what might be called scruples about the desirability of pronouncing certain words, of referring to dangerous concepts or phenomena in plain terms, though difficult to delimit, should likewise not be undervalued. That linguistic taboo in general exerted a lasting effect upon the minds of these poets, their audiences and their predecessors, that many words were to be suppressed or replaced by substitutes may be taken for granted, but it is almost impossible to settle the problem as to which word is omitted because the poet at the moment of composing a verse was consciously scrupulous; which word is wanting because it did not occur in his models; which elements are suppressed in imitation of real taboo; which omissions that might be due to taboo have in fact nothing to do with it. Is for instance, in 1, 144, 5 the substantive wanting because it was dangerous or unwished for?: *abhivrajadbhir vayunā navādhiṭa*; but see 5, 11, 1. Cf. also 4, 4, 1; 5. Special mention may be made of the elliptic indications of the cosmic space, the nature of which is beyond human understanding: 10, 149, 1 *atūrte* (sc. *rajasi* "der undurchschrittene, dessen Ende unerreichbar ist", G.) *baddham . . . samudram*; *ibid. askambhane* "in that which has no pillar", cf. 4, 56, 3 *avamśe*, etc. Renou<sup>72</sup>) may be right in ascribing this brevity to a "souci de silence". In Roman epitaphs the word for "illness" was often omitted; here reasons of taboo may have joined the tendency to avoid superfluities. Some places which may, perhaps, be regarded as exhibiting examples of taboo for decency's sake were collected by Renou<sup>73</sup>): 8, 1, 34 *sthūram* "(membre) raidi"; 10, 86, 16

<sup>72</sup>) Renou, *Ét. véd. et pān.*, I, p. 37.

<sup>73</sup>) Renou, *l.c.*

*romasam* “(fente) poilue” etc.: “il y a là un type familier, éventuellement argotique, d’ellipse, qui d’ailleurs n’empêche pas en d’autres passages la mention explicite, comme 9, 112, 4 ou 10, 95, 5”.

Sometimes a poet resorts to two adjectives in succession in order to characterize the non-expressed nominal idea: 1, 141, 5 *anu yat pūrvā aruhat sanājuvo | ni navyasiṣu avarāsu dhāvate* “when he (Agni) has grown through the former, old ones, he clings to the new ones, the later”; that is “Agni ensconces himself in trees and wood”. Cf. also 1, 164, 12 *sapatacakre ṣāḷare*; 15; 2, 3, 6 *sudughe payasvatī* (cows) is hardly more than an appositive epithet. Even combinations of three adjectives are welcome: 1, 120, 4 *vaṣaḥkṛtasyādbhutasya* (sc. *somasya*); 134, 5 *śukrāsaḥ śucayas turanyavo madesūgrāḥ* (sc. soma juices); 2, 11, 12; 3, 6, 6.

One cannot escape the conclusion that for a variety of causes and motives these poets did not resist the temptation to omit substantives on a rather large scale. Considering the traditional and to a certain extent esoterical character of this poetry, produced by men whose minds kept concentrating on the same myths, the same ideas, the same connection between powers and phenomena, whose thoughts were always formulating variations on the same themata, the frequency of these ‘omissions’ becomes however intelligible. For those who knew and who were initiated they were no serious impediment to comprehension, — or to an interpretation of their own. Cf. eg. 1, 94, 10; 136, 2; *dhūmaketunā* 2, 11, 3; 31, 7; 3, 8, 2; 31, 4; 5; 11; 12; 38, 1; 3; 39, 3; 4, 4, 11; 55, 4; 5, 42, 10.

Apart from the problem connected with the inclination of the ancient authors to avoid for reasons of linguistic ‘taboo’ etc. the ordinary names of the objects and beings described and to resort to substitutes, a problem to which we have already devoted some attention, apart from their habit to prefer an adjective instead of a substantive in order to emphasize a special aspect of a figure, an idea, or a phenomenon, there remains the question as to how far the exigencies of versification have exerted their influence on the syntactic and stylistic features under discussion. That they have been an important factor in the composition of the stanzas and pādas, in the choice of words and phrases may be taken for granted, but it is impossible to make any exact statement about this influence. In cases such as 3, 52, 1 ab=8, 91, 2 de where a noun is to be supplied the poet may have made use of more or less fixed and current word groups qualifying the soma, the sacrificial cake, or another oblation. Metrical convenience is doubtless not foreign to structures such as 1, 139, 3 fg; cf. perhaps also 3, 36, 5; 7, 67, 1. As a rule every stanza is with regard to syntax and contents a unity and many pādas likewise are syntactically speaking complete in themselves, that is to say: they constitute word groups, clauses or sentences. The impossibility of placing in one of the quarters of the stanza a word which in case of need could be dispensed with may have enlarged the number of shortenings: cf. e.g. 1, 38, 11



*maruto vīḷupānibhis* / . . . / *yāta* “O Maruts, with your strong-hoofed (horses) . . . go”; 1, 70, 7.<sup>74</sup>)

In addition to the observations made by Renou<sup>75</sup>) on the omission of the subject some relevant passages may briefly be dealt with. From these it will appear that the term ‘ellipsis’ is generally speaking not applicable here. It should, moreover, be remembered that the absence of an explicit subject may not only be due to a certain indifference on the part of the author — “il importe peu au poète, en bien des cas, que demeure dans l’indécis la nature du sujet, qu’on ne sache si telle action a pour agent le poète lui-même, l’officiant, le patron du sacrifice, la divinité . . .” (Renou) —, but also to his conviction that the audience knew to whom the events narrated were to be ascribed. There might also have been reasons of ‘taboo’ — the gods, according to the brāhmaṇas like what is concealed or unknown (ŚB. 6, 1, 1, 2); in Greek *ὁ θεός* may replace the name of a particular divinity. It should, further, be recalled that it is for the general speaker, and especially for him who is not accustomed to logical thinking and who in formulating his thoughts is centred in himself and in his own interests, not always easy precisely to indicate the subject; he does not always care for unambiguity. Nor does he survey the whole of his utterance, but as soon as his thoughts have reached another stage he goes on speaking without always troubling himself about the exigencies of a logically correct expression: cf. e.g. also N.T. 1 Cor. 10, 24 *μηδεις τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ζητείτω, ἀλλὰ < ἕκαστος* which is a less authoritative reading *> τὸ τοῦ ἐτέρου*. Hence such brachylogies as e.g. Plaut. Capt. 226 *nunc senex est in tostrina, nunc iam cultros attinet* “now the old fellow is in the barber’s shop, now < the barber > is reaching forth for the knife”. Hence also such instances of anacoluthon as Pereg. Aeth. 9, 7 *proficiscentes ergo . . . ambulans . . . pervenio*. The esoteric character of many texts has no doubt favoured the tendency under discussion: cf. 6, 3, 7; 7, 104, 23; 8, 72, 18. Moreover, the verbal forms of the third person may, also in other ancient Indo-European languages,<sup>76</sup>) express the so-called general personal subject (3rd sing.) or an indefinite plurality of subjects (3rd plur.). Practically speaking these forms are equivalent with the German *man* constructions, with ‘one’ or ‘they’ in English etc., the 3rd sing. also with Gr. *τις* “many a one, men, every one”: cf. in Homer, *N* 287 *οὐδέ κεν ἔνθα τεόν γε μένος καὶ χεῖρας ὄνοιτο; φασί, λέγουσι* “they say”; Thuc. 4, 130, 2 *κατὰ τὰς ἄνω πύλας, ἧ ἐπὶ Ποτειδαίας ἔρχονται*; in Latin, *si in ius vocat* “wenn einer einen vor Gericht lädt”; Anc. Icel. *segir* “es sagt einer”.

Not rarely the ‘subjectless’ third person singular implies the idea of “the person(s) (anyone) concerned”; in Greek, Isaeus 6, 44 *ὁ νόμος οὐκ*

<sup>74</sup>) Cf. also my article Syntax and Verse structure in the Veda, in Indian Linguistics, Turner Jub. Vol. I, 1958, p. 35ff.

<sup>75</sup>) Renou, *Ét. véd. et pāṇ.* I, p. 36.

<sup>76</sup>) See e.g. E. Schwyzer–A. Debrunner, *Griech. Grammatik*, II, München 1950, p. 245; 620; J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, I<sup>2</sup>, Basel 1926, p. 111ff.

ἔᾱ ἐπανίεναι, ἐὰν μὴ υἷὸν καταλίπη γνήσιον; remember also φ 142 οἶνοχοεῦει (viz. ὁ οἶνοχόος); Xen. An. 3, 4, 36 ἐκήρυξε (viz. ὁ κήρυξ). That this syntactic feature was not foreign to Vedic prose and post-Vedic Sanskrit was already observed by Speyer and Delbrück<sup>77</sup>): cf. e.g. TS. 6, 2, 4, 4 *yāvad āsīnaḥ parāpaśyati* “as far as one seated can espy”.

Now part of the instances of a non-expressed subject in the Ṛgveda belong, if I am not mistaken, to the category mentioned last. In 1, 69, 10 we may supply “those concerned”: *tmanā vahanto duro vy ṛṇvan* “selber ihn tragend öffnen (die Priester) die Tore” (G.), or: “öffnet man, öffnen die damit Beauftragten”. Similarly, 1, 141, 1 (“*dhīrāḥ*, die Sänger”, G.). ṚV. 4, 6, 11; 16, 2 *śaṃsāty uktham* (cf. also 6, 23, 5) may be translated: “man soll das Lobgedicht vortragen” or “the uktha must be recited”; the functionary in charge of this recitation was the hotar. Cf. also 1, 180, 2; 6, 15, 15.

A good example of the 3rd plur. occurs 5, 21, 3 *yajñeṣu devam īlate* “they (people, die Menschen, G.) implore thee at the sacrifices”. The “experts” (*kartavyatvenābhijñāḥ*) are according to S. the subject of 1, 24, 12: *tad in naktam tad divā mahyam āhuh*. Cf. also 7, 85, 2. Even in those cases in which a modern interpreter may feel uncertain “the person, functionary etc. concerned” can do duty: 6, 6, 1. Granting this brevity may, like the other structures dealt with in this article, be somewhat irritating in our eyes — read the commentaries on 2, 11, 8 —, in archaic Indo-European it does not seem to have been uncommon; the poets no doubt borrowed it from normal usage. Even in 1, 187, 6 *tavāhiṃ avasāvadhīt*, where G. doubts whether S. is right in adding *Indraḥ* or *Trita*, who is mentioned in st. 1, is the subject, the omission of the noun need not be a deviation from ordinary speech habits.<sup>78</sup>) In 10, 106, 1 celebrating the *Āsṁvins* the subject of the words “has them awakened to come jointly”, the subject must be the man praying or sacrificing (*yajamānaḥ* S.) or his prayer or recitation. In 2, 24, 14 a subjectless 3rd person sing. follows ad sententiam a plural *gāḥ*; G. inserts “(die Herde)”.

The context does not leave us in doubt as to the subject of 1, 52, 9 *akṛṇvata . . . rohaṇam divaḥ*: only the gods may be said to have performed the ascent of the sky. To those who knew the myth the subject is self-evident, the adj. *mānuṣapradhanāḥ* points, moreover, the same direction. In 1, 105, 1 the rays of the sun are, with S., to be considered the subject of pāda c, that celestial body itself being the explicit subject of a and b. In 2, 36, 1 *tubhyam hinvāno vaniṣṭha gā apaḥ, somaḥ* is the subject (S.); 3, 4, 5 *invanto viśvam prati yann ṛtena* S. added *devāḥ*; 58, 1 the subject

<sup>77</sup>) See Speyer, Ved. u. S. Syntax, p. 75f.; Delbrück, Altind. Syntax, p. 221.

<sup>78</sup>) One might perhaps recall the use of Fr. *on* instead of “il, elle”: “on parlera ainsi chaque fois qu’il s’agira de personnes auxquelles tout le monde pense, mais qu’on ne veut pas nommer, ou lorsqu’on désire donner à la conversation un ton confidentiel, faire des allusions etc.” F. Brunot, La pensée et la langue, Paris 1936, p. 278.



is *Uṣas*; 5, 37, 2 *yajamānaḥ* (S.); 41, 13 *marutaḥ* (S.). Cf. also 8, 1, 11.

Elsewhere however a definite subject must, in all probability, be supplied: 6, 3, 7.<sup>79</sup>)

In accordance with their character those nominal stems which are translated by infinitives do not take a subject: thus 1, 112, 1 *yāmann iṣṭaye* "auf dasz (die Ásvin) in ihrer Fahrt sich beeilen" (G.). (They may be accompanied by an acc.: 8, 48, 10 *indram pratiram emy āyuh*).

It is not surprising to find that the name of the god to whom a 'hymn' is dedicated after several repetitions often fails to turn up again: cf. e.g. 5, 18, 3 where Agni (cf. st. 1) is meant by the epithet *dirghāyusociṣam*; 6, 38, 5; 8, 72, 18. What is of greater interest is the absence of a proper name in the first stanza of a hymn.<sup>80</sup>) Not infrequently it is in that position replaced by one or more epithets, even when the hymn is not dedicated to the deity to whom these refer. Thus 8, 5, 1 — the *sūkta* praises the Ásvins — *dūrād iheva yat saty | aruṇapsur asiśvitat |*, where "of reddish appearance" refers to *Uṣas*; cf. 7, 71, 1; 1, 57, 1; 155, 1; 6, 38, 1; 8, 93, 1. Still more remarkable is the omission of a proper name which has not been mentioned before: thus 1, 104, 5 *jānati* "the knowing or expert one" must refer to *Saramā*, who in this Indra hymn, is commemorated in connection with the conflict with an inimical *Dasyu*. See also 6, 17, 11; 8, 90, 5. That, in 1, 117, 5 *Vandana* is meant, must be concluded from parallel passages (1, 116, 11 etc.). Cf. also 1, 119, 8 *agachataṇ kṛpamāṇam parāvati pituḥ svasya tyajasā nibādhitam* "ye (the Ásvins) came to him who lamented at a distance (viz. *Bhujyu*), whom his own father had deserted and pushed (into the water)". The stories connected with these names must however have been well known to the audience. Among a number of divinities one may be referred to by an epithet, the others by their names, cf. 1, 122, 3.

Passing mention may be made of the absorption of a nominal idea by a numeral with which it forms a frequent word group: 5, 37, 3 *purū sahasrā* (sc. 'miles') *pari vartayāte*: cf. the Engl. *mile* < Lat. *mīlia* (*passuum*); the substantive may be understood from the context: 6, 20, 4 *śataiḥ*: *śatasamkhyākair balaiḥ* (S.), "durch hundert (Streiche)" G.; 1, 126, 4 (cows); 174, 7; 4, 18, 3; 5, 52, 17; 6, 35, 1 *sahasrapoṣyam*. These vague indications of nominal concepts are especially characteristic of 'mystic' passages: 9, 102, 3 *trīṇi tritasya* [sous-entendu: *yojanā* is expressed in *pāda c*<sup>81</sup>)] "die drei [sc. Strecken] des T." (G.). Combination of numerals is likewise a favourite device: 10, 45, 2 *vidmā te agne tredhā trayāṇi* [*dhāma*, which occurs in b].<sup>82</sup>) Sometimes a poet was even tempted to compose stanzas such as 8, 72, 7 *duhanti saptaikām upa dvā pañca sṛjataḥ*.

<sup>79</sup>) See Geldner, o.c., II, p. 95; otherwise R. Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, II, Stuttgart 1897, p. 100.

<sup>80</sup>) See also Epithets in the *R̥gveda*, 's-Gravenhage 1959, p. 222.

<sup>81</sup>) Cf. also Geldner, o.c., III, p. 107.

<sup>82</sup>) Geldner, o.c., III, p. 201 und *Der Rigveda in Auswahl*, II, Stuttgart 1909, p. 164.

In studying those cases in which an adjective is, or seems to be, omitted we should also be aware of the tendency of translators to add bracketed explications where there has probably never been any shortening proper, i.e. no compound or phrase has been reduced to one of its components. All that was, in many cases, required was a situation in which a term was so self-evident as to do without any explicit determination. Was for instance the addition of the adj. "inimical" to the subst. "host" in 1, 102, 4 necessary?: *vayaṃ jayema tvayā yujā vṛtam* "we should like to conquer, with thee as a companion, the host". Or the addition "full" to the word for "vessels for drinking soma" (*camasāḥ*) in 1, 54, 9?: it is self-evident that the vessels which are offered to the god are filled.

Such qualifications as "good" or "bad", which are indeed often perfectly evident from the context, are not explicitly expressed in 3, 18, 2 *tapa śamsam . . . parasya* "verbrenn das (böse) Wort des . . . Fremden" (G.)<sup>83</sup>; cf. 1, 18, 3.

It is indeed a well-known fact that so-called voces mediae i.e. neutral expressions, like "fortune, name, quality, circumstance", often specialize in a pejorative or ameliorative sense: the Dutch expressions *een man van naam* "a distinguished man", and *kwaliteit* instead of *first* or *good quality* in hawkers' jargon may serve as examples in point. The phenomenon is not foreign to Sanskrit: ṚV. 1, 33, 13 *matim* "(hohe) Meinung". Thus G. is 4, 2, 5 right in rendering *sabhāvān* by "der (gute) Gesellschaft hat", and 6, 2, 2 *rajastūḥ* by "das . . . (weite) Strecken zurücklegt". In 3, 40, 2 "der (guten) Rat schafft" for *kratuvidam* is however incorrect, since *kratu* means "effective mental power"<sup>84</sup>

It is doubtful whether G. is right in translating instances such as 1, 128, 4 *kratvā vedhā iṣūyate* by "durch Umsicht ein (vorbildlicher) Meister für den, der den Pfeil schießt". This translation implies that "Meister" is an exact rendering of *vedhas*- and that the bracketed adjective has, for some reason or other, either been omitted by the author or been inserted by the translator in order to make the correct sense of the communication clear. But if *vedhas*<sup>85</sup> can really mean "guide"<sup>86</sup> no addition or explication whatever is needed.

The idea of "standing upright" may by itself imply the connotation of "being disposed, being at a person's disposal": 1, 134, 1 *ūrdhvā . . . tiṣṭhatu* "aufrecht (bereit) stehend" (G.). It is difficult to decide whether 2, 32, 2; 10, 61, 1 *ahan* has the somewhat special meaning of "sacrificial day" or an adj. (*pārye*, cf. 6, 26, 1 "decisive") is to be 'supplied'.

Not rarely there exists an idiomatic difference between two languages

<sup>83</sup>) For the meaning of *śams*- see Acta Orientalia 20 (Leiden 1948), p. 187.

<sup>84</sup>) For *kratu*- see Epithets in the Ṛgveda, The Hague 1959, p. 37f.

<sup>85</sup>) For the meaning of which see Renou, É.V.P. IV, Paris 1958, p. 68.

<sup>86</sup>) P. Thieme, Untersuchungen zur Wortkunde und Auslegung des Rigveda, Halle S. 1949, p. 46, n. 2.

with regard to the use, or the frequency, of certain adjectives. Whereas for instance German, like Dutch and other languages, prefers: "sie behaupten die Schwäche der Götter und leugnen die Schwäche in ihrem eignen Herze", in the Vedic idiom *hr̥dī* alone may be enough (2, 23, 16). The phrase 1, 151, 8 *manaso na prayuktiṣu* is therefore not elliptical: "wie auf (eigenen) Antrieb des Herzens" (G.). The Skt. *manasā yujānaḥ* (6, 49, 5) was in German clarified by the addition of an adj. "auf (bloszen) Gedanken . . ." (G.). Thus 6, 15, 14 *mahinā vi yad bhūḥ* should not be considered elliptical ("wenn du dich in (voller) Grösze entfallest" G.). Sometimes a non-elliptical expression may as to its meaning be equivalent to a single noun: 1, 47, 7; 137, 2 *sākaṃ sūryasya raśmibhiḥ* can no doubt be understood as if the adj. "first" has been omitted, which, I believe, is not the case. Thus 1, 135, 3 *sūrye sacā* may mean "bei (aufgehender) Sonne". In 1, 18, 1 *kakṣivāntam* means "another Kakṣivānt", cf. a (regular) *Croesus* and similar phrases. I would not follow G. in translating 5, 41, 9 *tuje nas tane parvatāḥ santu* by "zur Fortpflanzung des Geschlechts sollen uns die Berge (günstig) sein", because the idea of "furthering", conducing to, serving to" is implied in the dative which then often makes up the whole predicate.<sup>87)</sup> Cf. also 1, 151, 3; 4, 25, 2; 5, 38, 3.

Here also a bracketed word in G.'s translation not rarely is an explication rather than an indication of ellipsis: 6, 19, 12 *sūrasātau* "um dem (tapfersten) Helden"; 1, 52, 6; 3, 54, 7.

An idiom of special interest concerns the absence of a word for "(the) other(s)" where modern Western languages would have it or at least add it for the sake of clearness. Thus 2, 24, 11 *sa devo devān prati paprathe pṛthū* was justly translated "der Gott hat sich den (anderen) Göttern gleichkommend weit ausgedehnt". The explication lies in the well-known fact that a nominal polyptoton<sup>88)</sup> is, not only in the ancient I.-E. languages, a favourite means of denoting reciprocity: in Latin: *manus manum lavat*; Verg. Aen. 11, 632 *legitque virum vir*<sup>89)</sup>; in Homer, *O* 328 ἀνὴρ ἔλεν ἄνδρα "man slew man". The other functions fulfilled by these schemes — expression of a certain, often more or less pathetic, emphasis, insistence, unambiguousness — may be ignored here. Other R̥gvedic instances are: 1, 161, 7 *aśvād aśvam atakṣata* "aus einem Pferd zimmertet ihr ein (zweites) Pferd" (Geldner): *ekena vidyamānenāśvena aśvāntaram . . .* (Sāyaṇa); 2, 12, 1 *devo devān paryabhūṣat*. Where we would say "one — the two others" Sanskrit authors may express themselves as follows: 3, 2, 9 *tāsām ekām adadhur . . . dve . . . iyatuh* "of these they placed . . . the two (others) went". Cf. also 5, 73, 3 *anyad . . . cakram . . .* "(with the other . . .)".

One of the two nominal ideas may be implied in another term of the sentence: 1, 36, 13 *yad añjibhīr vāghadbhīr vihvayāmahe* "when we contend

<sup>87)</sup> See J. S. Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, Strassburg 1896, p. 14, § 48b.

<sup>88)</sup> See *Stylistic repetition in the Veda*, ch. XIII.

<sup>89)</sup> See also G. Landgraf, *Archiv f. lat. Lexik.* 5, p. 161ff.

(for it) with other adorned<sup>90</sup>) sacrificers”, the speakers belonging also to the class of persons who might call themselves *vāghat-* (cf. 3, 8, 10): the verb form expresses reciprocity and the two parties concerned seem to have the quality “adorned” in common. Similarly 8, 5, 16. Cf. also 10, 19, 1. Sometimes it is taken for granted that both groups are homogeneous: 1, 88, 2 *yānti rathatūrbhīr āsvaiḥ* “they go with horses that overtake other chariots”; or a grammatical peculiarity, e.g. genus, of the meaning of the sentence in general, suggests the addition “other(s)”: 1, 167, 7 *sthīrā cij janīr vahate* “(that she) though firm conveys other women with her”; 1, 173, 6 *pra . . . nṛbhyo asti* “he excels above other men”; cf. also 5, 27, 1. 2, 5, 5, *kwit tisṛbhya ā varam svasārah* “. . . (ihm) lieber als drei (andere)” (G.). Parallels in other languages are however not wanting: in Med. Dutch one could say: *dat ware ondervonden meerre moort dan (andere) sonden* “. . . murder rather than (other) sins”.

The idea of “other” may indeed be ‘implied’ in the nominal terms used: 1, 64, 13 . . . *sa marataḥ śavasā janāṃ ati tasthau* . . . “that mortal being surpasses all other men in might”; 1, 166, 14 *ā yat tataman vṛjane janāsaḥ : tadīyā janāḥ* (Mādhava); 2, 2, 10 *janān : asmatsamānān* (S.); 4, 4, 9; 5, 3, 5; 6; 33, 2; 8, 1, 3; 10, 27, 9. In 2, 33, 4 *sahūti* stands for “by simultaneous invocation of other gods”. The complement of ‘the other(s)’ may be constituted by the person(s) addressed: 1, 120, 4 *vi pṛchāmi . . . na devān : anyān d. na p., kiṃ tu yuvām eva sarvajñau pṛchāmīty arthaḥ* (S.): “ich frage . . . nicht die (anderen) Götter aus” (G.). ṚV. 2, 31, 2 may be quoted as an instance of an adverb implying the idea of “others”: *adha smā na ud avatā . . . ratham devāso abhi* “dann bringet . . . unseren . . . Wagen über (andere) zu Ehren”.

Instead of *anya- anya-* we may find zero: *anya-* : 8, 22, 4 *yuvo rathasya pari cakram iyata | irmānyad vām iṣanyati*.

The same idiom was adopted when the relation expressed is one of consistency or co-operation: 1, 26, 10 *viśvebhīr agne agnibhīr | imaṃ yajñam . . . / cano dhāḥ . . .* “with all other Agnis, O Agni, be thou satisfied with this act of worship”.

Still more remarkable are, from the point of view of modern Western usage, constructions such as 1, 122, 2, which deals with the pair of goddesses Night and Dawn, “(one like) a barren woman dressed in a coarse (?) garment, (the other) with the splendour of the sun, beautiful with golden ornaments”: *starīr nātkaṃ vyutaṃ vasānā | sūryasya śriyā sudṛśī hiraṇyāiḥ*.<sup>91</sup>)

<sup>90</sup>) For *añji-* see F. B. J. Kuiper, Vāk 2, p. 83; Renou, Études véd. et pāṇ. IV, Paris 1958, p. 109.

<sup>91</sup>) The elliptic dual — e.g. 1, 188, 6 *uśāsau* “dawn and night”; 2, 31, 5 *pṛthivī* “heaven and earth”; 3, 6, 4 *dyāvau* “id.”; 6, 34, 4 *māsā* “sun and moon”; 3, 31, 17 *kṛṣṇe* “night and dawn” — for particulars see the handbooks (cf. also Lingua 6 (1956), p. 89ff.) — has, with reference to the ‘ellipsis’ been discussed by Renou, Ét. véd. et pāṇ., I, p. 29f. I am not convinced that this dual originally was limited to names

It is worth noticing that not only the word for “other”, but also the noun itself may fail to turn up: 1, 164, 25 *tato mahṇā pra ririce mahitvā* “that is why it (the gāyatrī metre) surpasses (the other metres) in might and greatness”; in 1, 168, 1 *yajñā yajñā vaḥ samanā tuturvaṇiḥ* the idea of “other people” is implied.

There is another word which we would like to insert, in places, in order to throw an opposition which is implied in the context into greater relief: the word “(him etc.)self”. In 1, 147, 3 *ye pāyavo māmāteyaṃ te agne / pasyanto andhaṃ duriṭād arakṣan* the opposition between the protectors who were seeing, and the blind Māmāteya whom they preserved from evil is emphasized by the juxtaposition of these words; we could add “themselves” to “seeing”. The sun is 1, 152, 5 born without a horse but is a courser (*arvā*) himself. In 2, 13, 7 Indra has expanded the seas, being wide (*uruḥ*): we would add “himself”. The Āditya’s are 2, 27, 3 said to be *adabdhāso dipsantaḥ* “not to be deceived (hurt), intending to deceive (hurt)”.

As already observed there are obvious points of difference between the Vedic idiom and modern languages. One of them lies in the frequent absence of a word for “all, every, all other” where English, German or other languages would have it. Thus 1, 4, 4 *yas te sakhībhya ā varam* though translated by Monier-Williams<sup>92</sup>): “better than companions” — this may be right — may answer to our “whom you prefer to all other companions”; Geldner, less correctly, has: “als (alle) Freunde”. In 1, 84, 20 *viśvā ca na upamimīhi . . . / vasūni carṣaṇībhya ā*, lit. “allot us objects of value out of the peoples” means “et assigne-nous tous les biens de préférence aux (autres) tribus”.<sup>93</sup>)

Thus 1, 88, 2 *rathatūrbhir aśvaiḥ* means “with horses which overtake other chariots or the chariots of others”; 100, 5 *śrāvasyāṇi tūrvan* “outshining all other glorious deeds or the g. d. of all others”; cf. 185, 7. Occasionally a verb or predicate is used without a complement: in cases such as 1, 57, 3 *ā bhārā* this would have been “everything”; 141, 9; 173, 2; 186, 2.

Sometimes however G.’s “(alles)” is superfluous: 1, 32, 15 *pari tā babhūva* when *tā* being anaphorical includes what has been enumerated; cf. 1, 162, 10; 3, 5, 6; 34, 7; 60, 2, other instances being 1, 162, 10; 2, 3, 4; 24, 10; 3, 10, 7; elsewhere G.’s “all(es)” is a mere explanation: 3, 31, 8, or a concession to German usage 2, 33, 3 *śreṣṭho jātasya* “der Herrlichste (alles) Geborenen”; 1, 49, 3; 51, 4; 92, 9; 171, 5; 2, 1, 3; 2, 2; 3, 60, 4; 5, 51, 11; 59, 6. The addition of a word for “whole, complete” may likewise be suggested by a certain preference, in modern languages, for phrases in-

---

of gods (cf. *pitarau*, Gr. *Aἰαντε*). For the scheme RV. 7, 88, 3 *ā yad ruhāva varuṇas ca nāvam* “when we, V. (and myself) go on board” — cf. also 9, 95, 5 *indras ca* “(thou) and I.” — see Vāk 5, p. 63f. and H. Reichelt, *Awestisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg 1909, p. 353.

<sup>92</sup>) M. Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dict.*, 922.

<sup>93</sup>) Renou, *Gramm. véd.*, p. 318.

cluding it, rather than the belief that it is missing in the original text: 1, 33, 9 *mahinā* “mit deiner (ganzen) Grösze” (G.); cf. also 8, 35, 2. The word *viśva-* may on the other hand serve to denote the idea of “the universe, the whole world” (e.g. 1, 44, 5); of “all deeds, acts” (1, 51, 13), etc., cf. also 5, 73, 4; 75, 2.

Renou<sup>94</sup>) also drew attention to places such as 10, 111, 3 *indrah kila śrutya āsya veda*, where S. already supplied *asmadīyasya stotrasya*. Not rarely indeed a demonstrative pronoun suffices to bring a nominal concept to the mind of the hearer, who however is substantially assisted by context and situation in understanding the abbreviated phrase. In 3, 39, 1 the words *yat te jāyate viddhi tasya* (*stotrasya, ukthasya*, although a feminine ‘synonym’ precedes) mean “do thou take notice of that (hymn), which comes into being for thee”. In 10, 97, which is to praise the medicinal herbs, *asyai* in st. 19 stands for “to this herb”, this word being mentioned already several times. Cf. also 3, 38, 7; 8; 9 *tad in nv asya* etc.; 5, 3, 8. The omission of the substantive in a frequent phrase may be exemplified by the elliptical *iyam* which instead of *iyam pṛthivī* may mean “the earth”. Cf. 1, 152, 3 *asya (lokasya)*; 161, 13. Neither the above examples nor cases such as 1, 152, 2 (*eṣām*: of these people, persons, gods) impress as unnatural. It is apt to arise in those milieus which do not attach much importance to accurateness and explicit clearness in speaking. Sometimes a combination of a dem. and a poss. pronoun incites us to add a noun: 1, 152, 3 *kas tad vām . . . ciketa* (: *prasiddham karma*, S., Werk, G.).

ṚV. 5, 20, 2 may be quoted as a verse containing a personal pronoun implying a nominal concept *te* (sc. *dveṣaḥ*, cf. *pāda c*). See also 5, 62, 2.

Among the cases in which the brackets which are profusely strewn about in Geldner’s translation are apt to lead an inattentive reader astray, those concerning possessive pronouns rank first. In Sanskrit, this class of words is relatively seldom used,<sup>95</sup>) the language generally preferring to indicate the possessive relation by the genitive of the personal pronoun or by its stem forming the initial member of a compound. There is however a fourth method: the possessive relation may be implicit. As in both the Veda and Avesta<sup>96</sup>) these forms are rare,<sup>97</sup>) and the other ancient Indo-European languages also did not always express this relation explicitly<sup>98</sup>) — *ι 366 f. Οδτιν δὲ με κικλήσκουσι / μήτηρ ἡδὲ πατήρ* — there is no reason whatever for considering the absence of possessive pronouns in the passages

<sup>94</sup>) Renou, *Ét. véd. et pāṇ.*, I, p. 38.

<sup>95</sup>) See Speyer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, p. 197; *Ved. und Skt. Syntax*, p. 39; L. Renou, *Grammaire sanscrite*, Paris 1930, p. 369; J. Wackernagel–A. Debrunner, *Altindische Grammatik*, III, Göttingen 1930, p. 492f.

<sup>96</sup>) See W. Caland, *Zur Syntax der Pronomina im Awesta*, Amsterdam 1891, p. 51.

<sup>97</sup>) The colloquial language may have made a freer use of these words, see (Leumann–)Hofmann, *Lat. Grammatik*, p. 473 with regard to colloquial Latin.

<sup>98</sup>) See e.g. E. Schwyzer–A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik*, II, München 1950, p. 200.



marked in Geldner's translation by brackets to represent as many instances of ellipsis.

In many places, however, a translation into one of the modern Western languages requires a possessive pronoun where there is no pronominal form in the original Sanskrit text: 1, 36, 14 *ūrdhvo naḥ pāhy amhaso ni ketunā* "aufrecht schütze uns vor Not mit (deinem) Banner" (G.); 51, 7 *tava vajras cikite bāhvor hitaḥ*; 83, 3; 112, 1 *aṃśāya: yuṣmadīyabhāgāya* (S.); 116, 5; 119, 2; 122, 11; 151, 7; 163, 6 *śiro tava, S.) apaśyam*; 174, 1; 177, 5 *avasā: tvadrakṣanena* (S.); 183, 2 *rathaḥ: yuvayo r.* (S.); 2, 1, 14 *āsā devā havir adantī āhitam* (Agni is addressed): *tvadīyenāsyena* (S.); 33, 14; 3, 2, 6; 54, 21; 4, 3, 15; 16, 18; 5, 63, 4. A personal pronoun referring to the same person may occur in the preceding clause: 3, 1, 15 *īle ca tvā . . . havīrbhir | īle sakhītvam (tvayā saha, S.)*; cf. 6, 1, 13. Sometimes a demonstrative pronoun may be translated by a possessive: 2, 19, 7 *aśyāma tat sāptam*. The relative rarity of the pronominal expression of the possessive relation was already noticed by Patañjali who<sup>99</sup>) observed that phrases such as *svasyām mātari* were unusual, because the possessive relation is apparent from the context<sup>100</sup>); cf., in Greek, the sentence *οἱ γονεῖς στέργουσι τὰ τέκνα* means "parents love their children".<sup>101</sup>) The absence of any grammatical device to express the possessive relation in Ṛgvedic texts should therefore not be considered a case of ellipsis.

Not rarely a translator has the option of a personal and a possessive pronoun: thus G. translated 1, 34, 11 *bhavataṃ sacābhuvā* by "seid (uns) Beistehet!"; 36, 6 *yakṣi devān suvīryā* by "bitte die Götter um Meisterschaft (für uns)!" This however is a matter of translating technique.

Apart from this point there are various cases in which, from our point of view, a personal pronoun seems to be lacking. ṚV. 1, 36, 9 *saṃ sīdasva mahām asi* requires a translation: "do thou sit down with (us), thou art great", or, to follow S. "do thou sit down on the barhis (*barhiṣy upaviśa*)"; 5, 65, 6 *saṃ ca nayathah* "bringet (uns) zusammen (G., S. otherwise); 1, 63, 3 *tvam śuṣṇam . . . kutsāya . . . sacāhan* "thou slewest Ś. on behalf of K. together (with him)"; 89, 9 *śatam in nu śarado anti devāḥ* "ihr Götter, hundert Jahre liegen vor (uns)"; cf. also 3, 3, 6 *antar īyate* "he moves between (both of them)". ṚV. 2, 11, 14 *sajośaso ye ca mandasānāḥ* "die einträchtig (mit dir) sich berauschen" (G.). ṚV. 1, 51, 1 *bhuje . . . abhi vipram arcata* "den Redekundigen besinget (euch) zu Nutz!" (G.); 6, 16, 26.

A demonstrative pronoun may, if referring to the 'third person', be likewise left unexpressed: 2, 30, 3.

Often a pronoun of the 2nd pers. fails to turn up in clauses including a vocative: 1, 62, 11 . . . *matayo dasma dadruḥ* ". . . the prayers have run (to thee), O powerful one!"; 13 . . . *gotama indra navyam atakṣad*

<sup>99</sup>) Patañjali on V. 3 on Pāṇ. 3, 1, 19.

<sup>100</sup>) See also A. Debrunner–J. Wackernagel, *Altind. Gramm.* III, Göttingen 1930, p. 492f.; Schwyzler–Debrunner, *Griech. Gramm.* II, p. 200.

<sup>101</sup>) Cf. Kühner–Gerth, *Ausf. Gramm. d. Griech. Sprache, Satzlehre II*, p. 555f.

*brahma* . . . ; 86, 6; 130, 6; 135, 6; 151, 4; 168, 6; 182, 7; 2, 6, 6; 33, 12; cf. also 1, 153, 2; or in clauses including a pronoun and a vocative: 1, 83, 1; 2, 28, 2.

In clauses containing the pronoun in another case form this is not repeated: 2, 11, 11 *pr̥ñantas te kukṣī vardhayantu* "filling thy belly they must refresh (thee)"; 28, 2. The person concerned must, however, not infrequently be understood from the context and situation: 1, 122, 1; 129, 10; 132, 3; 134, 6; 183, 4; 185, 10; 2, 11, 15; 3, 16, 6; 5, 1, 10; 31, 13; cf. also 1, 111, 5 *ṛbhur bharāya saṃ śiśātu sātīm / . . . asmān aviṣtu*; 116, 19.

The pronoun is sous-entendu in cases such as 1, 70, 10 *vi tvā naraḥ . . . saparyam / pitur . . . vi vedo bharanta* "dich ehren die Männer . . . ; sie verteilen (dich) wie das Besitztum des . . . Vaters" (G.); 104, 8 *mā no vadhīr indra mā parā dāḥ*. Cf. also 1, 71, 10; 78, 1; 118, 4; 121, 5; 186, 3; 5, 55, 9. The pronoun is omitted after a noun to which it would have referred: 2, 28, 7 . . . *ye ta iṣṭāv enaḥ kṛṇvantam asura bhr̥ñanti* "(thy weapons) which when thou art after him who commits sin, O Asura, injure (him)". Places such as 1, 165, 4 are rather to be regarded as brachylogical; cf. 5, 6, 8.

A pronominal complement of a participle may remain unexpressed: 1, 123, 10 *eṣi devi devam iyakṣamāṇam* "thou goest, O goddess to the god who is longing (for thee)". A dative translatable by an infinitive does not require the repetition of a pronoun: 5, 59, 1; cf. 6, 22, 3. The pronoun used in translating may be implicit: 1, 165, 3 *sam pr̥chase* "du willst (mit uns) paktieren" (G.).

Thus the Ṛgveda corroborates the statement made by Speyer<sup>102)</sup> with regard to post-Vedic Sanskrit: the oblique cases of the personal pronoun are not always wanted in Sanskrit, when indispensable in English. Whereas an English translator is bound to say: "she (the cat) reached the young birds, took them to her hole and devoured them" a Sanskrit author writes: *pakṣiśāvakān ākramya koṭaram ānīya khādati*. Latin examples of the same economy are not wanting: Plaut. Merc. 1003 *sed istuc uxor faciet* "but your wife will attend to that"; M.G. 446 *quin tenes altrinsecus* "why don't you grab her on the other side?"; 450 *hosticum hoc mihi domicilium est, Athenis domus est Atticis*.<sup>103)</sup>

Passing mention may also be made of the scheme 5, 48, 3 *satam vā yasya pracaran sve dame / saṃvartayanto vi ca vartayann ahā* "but to whose house come a hundred (gods), (for him) they will unroll his days (again), when they roll them up". The correlative demonstrative pronoun is indeed in Vedic verses not rarely wanting.<sup>104)</sup> In post-Vedic texts this shorter construction seems to turn up especially in poetry and Buddhist texts,<sup>105)</sup>

<sup>102)</sup> Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, p. 193. For the personal pronouns as subject see my relative article in Acta Orientalia, 19, p. 211 ff.

<sup>103)</sup> A comparative study of this feature would be a desideratum.

<sup>104)</sup> Speyer, Ved. u. S. Syntax, p. 84, § 221.

<sup>105)</sup> This idiom awaits closer investigation; cf. e.g. Renou, Gramm. sanscrite, Paris 1930, p. 530.



e.g. Mbh. 3, 68, 3 *gavāṃ sahasraṃ dāsyāmi, yo vas tāv ānayaṣyati*; Rām. 3, 19, 7 *na hi paśyāmy ahaṃ loke yaḥ kuryān mama vipriyam*; Aśv. Saund. 15, 14 *nivṛttaṃ yasya dauḥśalyam . . . | hanti pāṃsubhīr ātmānam* "he who has given up evil ways . . . throws dirt over himself". The absence of a pronominal 'antecedent' is even blamed by Mammaṭa, Kāvyaṇ. 7, 228 (p. 187 f. of Ganganatha Jha's translation.<sup>106</sup>). Latin syntax seems to show us a fairly parallel development: according to Hofmann<sup>107</sup> relative clauses "ohne Bezugsmasse" were "speziell umgangssprachlich": they are frequent in early Latin — cf. e.g. Plaut. Poen. 764 *ita mihi renuntiatumst, quibus credo satis*; the great classical authors avoid this scheme, although now and then an example may crop up in Cicero's letters or philosophical writings: Tusc. 5, 20 *Xerxes . . . praemium proposuit, qui invenisset novam voluptatem*. Greek instances are far from wanting and certainly no poetic licence or innovation: *H* 401 *γνωτὸν δέ, καὶ δὲ μάλα νήπιός ἐστιν*<sup>108</sup>; cf. also the proverb *ὄν οἱ θεοὶ φιλοῦσιν ἀποθνήσκει νέος*. The frequent Homeric instances are, I am sure, no "emplois elliptiques sans antécédents"<sup>109</sup>: they no doubt are a continuation of an ancient and widespread idiom.<sup>110</sup> Originally the so-called relative pronoun must, in my opinion<sup>111</sup> have been a distinguishing, defining and annunciatory includer, which was to a high degree indifferent as to the logical relations between the elements which it introduced and the rest of the sentence. That the antecedent of a 'relative clause' was no necessity is also apparent from Vedic prose texts, e.g. TS. 3, 4, 1, 4 *yasyaiṣā yajñe prāyascittih kriyata iṣṭvā vasiyān bhavati* "(he), for whom in the sacrifice this expiation is performed, comes into a better condition by his worshipping".<sup>112</sup>

Some other Vedic examples are: RV. 1, 35, 6 *iha bravītu ya u tac ciketat*, where *saḥ*, nom. is left non-expressed; 1, 92, 20; 6, 49, 6 *yasya gīrbhīr | . . . jagad ā kṛṇudhvam* "machtet alles was lebt, (dem) geneigt, an dessen Loblied (ihr Freude habt)!" (G.); 5, 7, 8 *yasmai . . . | (tam) suṣūr asūta mātā*; 41, 2 *te no mitro varuṇo . . . juṣanta | namobhīr vā ye dadhate* (instead of *tān vā . . . ye*); 6, 36, 5 *śrudhi śrutya (tasya) yo duvoyuḥ*. Hence also 1, 70, 5 *sa hi kṣapāvāṃ agnī rayīṇāṃ | dāśad yo asmā araṃ sūktaiḥ*. Cf. 1, 116, 1; 127, 2; 164, 3; 2, 30, 7; 4, 2, 14; 6, 4, 5. Needless to observe that the pronoun 'wanting' might have appeared in different case forms (syntactic functions). Similarly *yathā* (viz. *tathā*) 2, 4, 9; 8, 43, 11 and *aganma yatra . . .* "we have gone to where . . .". Cf., e.g., in Med. Dutch constructions such as *doe ghinc Th. daer die Iode woende*.

<sup>106</sup>) Allahabad 1925.

<sup>107</sup>) (Leumann-)Hofmann, Lat. Gramm., p. 707.

<sup>108</sup>) Cf. Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c. II, p. 640.

<sup>109</sup>) P. Chantraine, Gramm. homérique, II, Paris 1953, p. 338.

<sup>110</sup>) Delbrück, Vergl. Syntax, III, Strassburg 1900, p. 300ff.; A. Vaillant, Manuel du vieux slave, I, Paris 1948, p. 341; R. v. Planta, Gramm. d. osk. umbr. Dialekte, II, Strassburg 1897, p. 480.

<sup>111</sup>) See my relative article in *Lingua* 4 (Amsterdam 1954), p. 1ff.

<sup>112</sup>) Cf. also Delbrück, Altind. Syntax, p. 561, § 275.

In cases such as 3, 22, 3 *yā rocane parastāt sūryasya / yās cāvastād upatiṣṭhanta āpaḥ* no anaphorical pronoun is required: (“... jenseits der Sonne und ... unterhalb (dieser) ...”, G.): the noun is placed ἀπὸ κοινῶς.

The occurrence of the type 1, 37, 12 *maruto yad dha vo balaṃ / janāṃ acucyavītana* “O M. considering your strength, ye have ...” was already discussed by Delbrück and Speyer<sup>113</sup>): cf. the Latin schema: *qua erat clementia Caesar victos conservavit hostes*.

Mention may also be made of 5, 44, 2 where a noun is to be supplied after *ya-*: ... *uparasya yāḥ svaḥ* “die (Strahlen) der unteren Sonne” (G.).

A clause may on the other hand be also deficient in a relative element. In 6, 29, 4 a pronoun *yasmin* is twice sous-entendu: *sa ... / yasmin ... / [yasmin] indram nara stuvanto ... / [yasmai] ukthā śaṃsanto ...*; 5, 18, 4 ... *yeṣu ... / ... ye / stīrṇam [yeṣām] barhiḥ ...*; in 1, 31, 5 a relative pronoun belonging to Agni in pāda a is in d suppressed after a *ya-* clause determining a word occurring in b. Is G. right in his interpretation of 6, 43, 2?

A curious difference in the use of adverbs expressing relative time may be established beyond reasonable doubt. As is well-known, the modern Western languages diverge with regard to the linguistic expressions of such ideas as *newly married*: whereas English in this expression uses the adverb of “new” — but *new-born, new-built, new-paved* —, French and German, following Latin: *novus maritus, nova nupta*, have the adjective itself: *nouveau marié, neu verheiratet*; the Dutch language, however, possesses a special adverb: *pas getrouwd*. The use of the adjective for “new” must, in ancient times, have been widespread: in the Rāmāyaṇa 5, 11, 17 the phrase *pramadā navoḍhāḥ* means “newly married young women” — according to the Petr. Dict. this is the oldest occurrence — and the substantive *navoḍhā* is, in later documents, found beside *navoditam sūryam* “the newly risen sun” (Mbh.) etc.; *navanīta-* “fresh butter” however occurs as early as the TS. (2, 3, 10, 1 etc.). The Greek adverb *νέον*, though not completely synonymous, may do the same duty as the Dutch *pas*: τ 400 *παῖδα νέον γεγαῶτα*.

In the following places of the R.V. this idea is, in connection with “born”, left unexpressed: 1, 60, 3 *taṃ navyasī ... ā jāyamānam / sukīrtir ... aśyāḥ* “may the newest hymn of praise reach him (Agni), the new born one”; the present participle represents the process in actu; 1, 63, 1 ... *yo ha śusmaiv / dyāvā jajñānaḥ pṛthivī ame dhāḥ* “. . . der du (Indra) (eben) geboren durch deinen Ungestüm Himmel und Erde in Panik versetzt” (G.): *tadānīm eva prādurbhūtaḥ san* (S.); 1, 12, 3; 69, 2 (*prajātaḥ*); 3, 1, 4; 3, 10; 6, 5; 8, 4 (*jāyamānaḥ*); 51, 8; 10, 1, 1. The order of words may e.g. 1, 12, 3 *agne devāṃ ihā vaha / jajñāno ...* have contributed to a certain relief of the idea of being born. There are however places exhibiting the particle *eva*: 2, 2, 1 *yo jāta eva ... / devo devān kratunā paryabhūṣat* “who as soon as born ...”.

<sup>113</sup>) Delbrück, Altind. Syntax, p. 562; Speyer, Ved. u. S. Syntax, § 272, 4.

Among the other adverbs which in an idiomatic translation into English or German are often to be inserted are: “formerly, before now”: 3, 32, 13 *yajñenendram avasā cakre arvāg | ainam sumnāya navyase vavrtyām* “durch das Opfer habe ich (früher) den I. . . hierher gebracht. Zu neuer Huld möchte ich ihn herlenken” (G.), the verb form (perfect) however indicates that the process was performed in the past. In a similar opposition between “formerly” and now (1, 48, 3) only *nu* “now” is expressed: *wāsoṣā uchāc ca nu devī* “U. ist (früher) aufgeleuchtet und die Göttin wird auch jetzt aufleuchten” (G.). Cf. also 1, 110, 1 *tatam me apas tad u tāyate punaḥ* “mein Werk ward (früher) . . . , es wird aufs neue . . .” (G.); 2, 11, 11; 3, 9, 2; 17, 2; ṚV. 3, 29, 16 now, today: (up to now); 8, 38, 9.

Non-expression of an indication of an opposition occurs also 1, 191, 1 [improper]: proper, real; 2, 2, 2 [by day]: at night; 6, 48, 6 bull: [cows].

Whereas Dutch or German speakers prefer to say *iemand weer ziende maken, einer wieder sehend machen* the adv. *punar* may be omitted in Sanskrit: 1, 116, 14 *yuvam ha kṛpamānam akr̥ṇutam vicakṣe*; similarly 1, 117, 7; 144, 4 *divā na naktam palito yuvājani* “. . . ward . . . (wieder)-geboren” (G.); cf. 3, 8, 5. Compare also 2, 2, 6; 1, 164, 19. In 1, 121, 4 “to give” is used where we would expect to find “to give back”.

The use made by the modern languages of copulative conjunction is rather different from that in the ancient tongues, which, to mention only this, often prefer asyndeton. Thus 1, 58, 5 *sthātuś caratham bhayate patatri-ṇaḥ* where we would say “. . . and (or also) the birds”. Cf. 1, 77, 4 (sc. likewise).

Instead of *adya* in 1, 35, 11 we would prefer “also today”, because the adverb is correlated with *pūrvyāsaḥ* in the first half of the stanza. For “also, even” see 1, 126, 5; 5, 44, 2 “the sun shines (also) for him who does not fan”; 1, 56, 3. The opposition makes it in 5, 4, 6 clear that in translating an “also” is required: “As thou protectst the gods, do thou (also) rescue us . . .”.

Other instances concern the Engl. *only*, Germ. *nur*: 5, 44, 8; the Germ. *sonst*: 3, 6, 8; the Germ. *blosz*: 2, 40, 3; 3, 35, 4; the Engl. *always*: 1, 6, 4; 3, 1, 6.

Sometimes the idea expressed by the adverb which we feel tempted to add in our translation is implied in the verb form of the text. Thus 3, 31, 5 *prajānann . . . viveśa* “der kundige hat (seitdem) . . . eingeschlagen” (G.): the perfect may indicate that the subject not only set about it that way in the past, but continues to do so into the present.

Occasionally the syntactic structure of the verse or the order of words intimate a certain relation between clauses or cola which, in other languages, might be expressed by an adverb. The words 6, 31, 3 . . . *sūryasya | muṣāyaś cakram avive rapāṃsi* were translated by G.: “. . . raube das Rad der Sonne!” (So) hast du die Scharten ausgewetzt”: the position of the second verb may, however, point to the relation suggested by “then, in that case, G. so”.

The English particle *like*, the German *als* is implied in cases such as 1, 123, 5 *jayema tam dakṣiṇayā rathena*. The particle *iti* characterizing the direct construction is in post-Vedic Sanskrit not indispensable: Manu 9, 183 *sarvās tās tena putreṇa putriṇyo manur abravīt*; similarly, ṚV. 1, 105, 17, where G. inserts "also".<sup>114)</sup>

It is however questionable whether G. is right in interpreting 1, 136, 3 *jāgrvāmsā dive dive* as "(früh) erwacht Tag für Tag"; it may have sufficed to commemorate the regular awakening of the gods. In 3, 10, 9 *jāgrvāmsaḥ sam indhate* I would prefer "they kindle as soon as they have woken up" to "(früh) erwacht" (G.). Cf. also 3, 29, 2.

Another frequent ellipsis concerns the object of verbs which constitute, with that object, familiar word groups. If in certain Roman milieus *ducere exercitum* or *movere castra* were oft-repeated word groups the speaker could, if context and situation left no doubt, omit the accusatives without causing any inconvenience to his partner. In a large number of cases the so-called absolute use of verbs — e.g. Lat. *obire* "to die" — owes its origin to this type of ellipsis. Here also, individual speakers or authors may add new instances to those which are generally current.<sup>115)</sup>

It is especially in the more or less technical or otherwise specialized vocabulary of 'Sondersprachen' that a term of wider application and frequent occurrence is, for convenience and because of insufficient ability to perceive the subtle distinctions between the general and the particular, often used where a more specialized and subordinate concept would from a strictly logical point of view have been the correct expression. "Es ist . . . in den Fachsprachen nicht nötig, eine Vorstellung anders als mit dem der übergeordneten Vorstellung entsprechenden Wort zu bezeichnen, da eine andere als die gemeinte spezielle Bedeutung gar nicht in den Vorstellungsbereich passen würde".<sup>116)</sup> Whereas the sense of Lat. *conficere* was, in general, "to make a thing (completely) ready, to arrange, accomplish, execute", it has, in French, been preserved in the special vocabulary of confectioners in the sense of preparing fruits with sugar etc.; from the same word family English has the noun *confection* (< *confectio*), *confectioner* etc., and in the dressmakers' vocabulary *confection* in the meaning of "a fashionable woman's garment". It is evident that these 'specialized' meanings may also develop without any shortening of current phrases by ellipsis, as has for instance often been maintained in connection with such well-known 'semantic shifts' as Lat. *ponere* "to put, place set" > Fr. *pondre* "to lay (of hens)". Anyhow, in the following examples the unexpressed nominal idea must have been present to the mind of the poet. ṚV. 1, 15, 9 *neṣṭrād iṣyata* (sc. *somam*, cf. 1, 181, 6) "pour (sc. the soma) out of the vessel of the neṣṭr"; 58, 1 *ā devatātā haviṣā vivāsati* (*devān*, S.)

<sup>114)</sup> Cf. also Renou, *Gramm. védique*, p. 392.

<sup>115)</sup> For the omission of verbs in frequent formulas see also J. Svennung, *Anredeformen*, Uppsala 1958, p. 19 etc.

<sup>116)</sup> E. Gamillscheg, *Französische Bedeutungslehre*, Tübingen 1951, p. 48.

“er bittet (die Götter) durch die Opferspende zum . . .”; 63, 7 *barhīr na yat sudāse vr̥thā var̥k* (sc. the enemies, cf. 6, 18, 8); 82, 6 *dadhiṣe gabhastyoḥ* : 6, 29, 2 *ā raśmayo gabhastyoḥ* ; 92, 12 *paśūn na citrā subhagā prathānā (tejāṃsi, S.)*; 101, 1 *yaḥ kṛṣṇagarbhā nirahan* ; 103, 2 *vajreṇa hatvā* (sc. *vr̥tram*) ; 105, 2 *duhe* (sc. her husband; cf. AthV. 14, 2, 14); 3, 33, 12 *atāriṣuḥ* (sc. the river); 4, 1, 11 *āyoyuvānaḥ (dhūmakāreṇātmanam āyodayan vartate . . . yad vā . . . tāni tejāṃsi svātmani miśrikurvan, S.; viz. die Glieder, Flügel, G.)*; 25, 4 *indrāya sunavāma (indrārthaṃ somābhiṣavaṃ kuryām)* ; 5, 47, 1 *prayuñjati* ; 48, 2 *tirate* (sc. his life); 51, 15 *aghnatā* ; 6, 18, 5 *iṣayantam*. Sometimes it is a nominal form which expresses the more special sense of a root in an objectless construction: 5, 45, 2 *ā . . . gavām mātā jānatī gāt* “the mother of the cows came knowing (the way) . . .”; 1, 14, 5 *aram̐kṛtaḥ* “zurecht machend, das Opfer zurechtend” (Grassmann); the verb *aram̐kṛ-* is also used in its more general sense: 2, 5, 8; 5, 44, 8.

It is not possible to draw a hard-and-fast line between these occurrences and the so-called absolute use of the verb. A verb, which admits of the transitive construction, is usually regarded as being used absolutely when it does not enter into its usual construction with a nominal case form, while suggesting a vague or general object, e.g. in Dutch *hij eet* “he is eating” for “he is having his meal; he has gone to table”: particulars about the object are irrelevant. “Le régime . . . est généralisé et indéterminé, p. ex. manger dans une phrase telle qu’il faut manger pour vivre”<sup>117</sup>); cf. also Fr. *l’homme propose et Dieu dispose*. The difference between an absolute use of a verb and an ellipsis is sometimes neglected, or the definition given is rather wide and genetical connection between both phenomena is taken for granted: “Ist, wie es nicht selten vorkommt, der Objektsbegriff als selbstverständlich aus dem Zusammenhang zu ergänzen, so entwickelt sich bald ein absoluter, prägnanter Gebrauch des Verbums, wo man nicht mehr von eigentlicher Ellipse sprechen kan”<sup>118</sup>). I would prefer to distinguish, at least theoretically, between an absolute use of a verb and ellipses which have become traditional. The elliptic character of a verb may be completely lost so that other complements become usual instead of the original transitive complement: Suet. Tit. 5, 3 *cum . . . nave appulisset*.<sup>119</sup>) As already stated, it is however not always easy to decide whether a verb is used absolutely or elliptically. In cases such as RV. 10, 147, 5 *pitvo na dasma dayase vibhaktā* G. may be right: “wie ein Verteiler der Speise teilst du, Meister, (die Schätze) aus”, because of the preceding *pitvaḥ*. Cf. also 10, 89, 1.

The verb (*pra-*)*śams-* “praise, extol, recite” is often accompanied by

<sup>117</sup>) Ch. Bally, *Linguistique générale et linguistique française*<sup>3</sup>, Berne 1944, p. 113; 311. I would not include the sentence *l’âge emporte les plaisirs* among the examples.

<sup>118</sup>) E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, II, Lund 1956, p. 243f.

<sup>119</sup>) Cf. also J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, Heidelberg 1936, §§155f.

names of gods, or by pronouns referring to these: *agnim, indrāgnī, tvā, yam*; by expressions such as *śardho mārutam; tad te nāma; pūṣṇo mahitvam*, but also without any object in a pregnant or absolute sense: 3, 53, 3 *śamsāvādhvāryo* “let us recite, O adhvaryu”<sup>120</sup>; 5, 42, 7 *yaḥ śamsate stuvate śambhaviṣṭhaḥ*. In the clauses 5, 77, 1 *śamsanti kavayaḥ pūrvabhājah* and 6, 39, 4 the verb is of course used transitively. Whereas 5, 80, 3 *eṣā gobhir aruṇebhir yujānā* “putting red cows (sc. to the chariot)” and 6, 3, 5 *sa id asteva prati dhād asiṣyan* “wie ein Schütze, der schieszen will, legt er (den Pfeil) auf” (G.) are instances of usual ellipsis rather than absolute constructions — the objects are not ‘vague and general’; we might compare such well-known Latin instances as *ducere (exercitum, copias), obire (mortem, diem supremum)*<sup>121</sup> —; whereas 1, 120, 12 *kathā vidhāty apracetāḥ* “how must the foolish one worship [ye]” is rather an example of a sous-entendu (*vām* occurs in a and b), the verb *takṣ-* is 10, 53, 10 no doubt used absolutely: *yābhir amṛtāya takṣatha* “womit ihr für den Unsterblichen zimmert” (G.). According to Geldner 4, 1, 9 *sa cetayan manuṣo yajñabandhuḥ* means *s. c. m.* (gen. sing.) *m.* (acc. plur.) *y.* “als der Opfergenosse des Manu erleuchtet er (die Menschen)”; it is however possible to take *c.* to be an ‘absolute’ verb. Absolute is also *asmai . . . sam adhve . . . ā bhara* “für diesen . . . bring (alles) zum Opfer zusammen” (G.) in 1, 57, 3.

Typical instances are those phrases in which verb and subject derive from the same root, e.g. 4, 55, 2 *vidhātāro vi te dadhur ajasrāḥ*: here I cannot agree with Renou<sup>122</sup> in considering the absence of an object due to “le souci bien connu de condenser l’expression dans une séquence de mots allitérants (et de maintenir à l’écart) les éléments qui auraient risqué de rompre l’harmonie”. In combinations such as 10, 161, 1 *grāhīr jagrāha . . . enam* “seizure has seized him”<sup>123</sup> the subject creates the impression of being ‘a vague concept’, a divine power of indefinite character and incidental occurrence, supposed to manifest every time when the special action which is ascribed to it takes place. Not infrequently the verb is accompanied by an object: AV. 6, 19, 1 f. *pavamānaḥ punātu mā* “let the purifying one purify me”, but in other cases no complement is needed: AV. 4, 39, 1 *saṃnamah saṃ namantu* “let the reverencers pay reverence”; cf. AV. 4, 15, 16 *vātu vātaḥ* “let the wind blow”. Thus the above phrase *vidhātāro vi dadhuḥ* means “they have as arrangers (disposers) arranged (disposed)”, i.e. “being the divine powers in charge of disposing or arranging they have acquitted themselves of their task”. That in 7, 66, 11 *vi ye dadhuḥ śaradam māsam ād ahar | yajñam aktuṃ cād ṛcam* / etc. particular gods are related to have instituted day and night, seasons and sacrifice does not contradict the above conclusions.

<sup>120</sup>) See Geldner, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 392.

<sup>121</sup>) Considered however examples of absolute use by Löfstedt o.c. and other scholars.

<sup>122</sup>) Renou, *Ét. véd. et pāṇ.* I, p. 36.

<sup>123</sup>) Cf. Stylistic repetition in the Veda, p. 236f.



Though intelligible enough, the absolute use of participles deserves a short discussion. Not infrequently indeed the participle of a verbal stem is much more common in this construction than the personal form. The verb *stu-* "to praise" does, it is true, occur absolutely — e.g. 8, 1, 30 *stuhī stuhīd . . .*; 6, 23, 5 *sute some stumasi* —, but it is only the participle *stuvat-* which in a variety of case forms is of frequent occurrence: 10, 46, 10 *sa yāmann agne stuvate vayo dhāh*, etc. Similarly *vidhat-*, e.g. 7, 16, 12 *dadhāti ratnam vidhate* "Agni bringt dem Verehrer das Kleinod" (G.) etc.; 10, 106, 9 *tarat-*. These participles have indeed practically speaking become adjectives expressing the meaning of a nomen agentis: *stuvat-* "the praiser", etc.; 6, 41, 4 *etaṃ titirva upa yāhi yajñam* "zu diesem Opfer komm, du Überwinder" (G.).

A similar 'pregnant' use belongs to those nouns which may be translated by infinitives in contexts such as 6, 17, 8 *adha tvā viśve pura indra devā / ekaṃ tavasaṃ dadhire bharāya* ". . . um (den Sieg) zu gewinnen" (G.): the noun *bhara-* "carrying, bearing" also means "carrying away gain, booty, a prize etc."; the Dutch absolute *winnen* "to win (a prize, the victory etc.)" would be an excellent translation. Cf. e.g. also 10, 104, 5 *ūtiṃ vitire dadhānāh*.

Special attention may be drawn to the rather frequent absence of a substantive expressing a meaning related to that of the verb with which it would have been connected. Thus 1, 6, 8 *sahasvad arcati* "starts a triumphant (song, eulogy)"; 1, 36, 8 *uru kṣayāya cakrire* "sie haben sich ein weites (Land) zum Wohnen bereitet" (G.); cf. also 1, 179, 3.

Whereas the above instances are characterized by the occurrence of an adjective, there is no adjective, but another element which adds to the intelligibility of the passage in 1, 40, 8 *hanti rājabhiḥ* "he slays (viz. the enemy) together with the kings"; 4, 14, 3; 5, 22, 1 *pra . . . / arcā pāvaka-śociṣe*; 52, 1; 6, 16, 22.

Not infrequently the verb and the omitted noun are, it is true, not related in sense, but the latter is easily understood from the context: 1, 80, 10 *vṛtram jaghanvām asṛjad* (viz. *apaḥ*; *tanniruddhā apaḥ*, S.); 84, 9; 116, 1; 117, 6; 128, 5; 140, 3 and 5 (participle); 144, 7; 166, 6; 185, 7; 188, 10 *devebhyaḥ sṛja* (viz. the victim, cf. also 2, 3, 10 with a participle); 189, 7; 190, 6; 2, 3, 11; 4, 5, 13.

The elliptical character of instances such as 1, 51, 12 is clear: here a genitive dependent on the absent noun is immediately followed by the predicate: *śāryātasya prabhṛtā yeṣu mandase* "(viz. the soma draughts) of Ś. are offered, in which thou delightest"; cf. also the structure *śrutam vṛṣanā* (viz. *āhvānam stotram vā*, S.) *pastyāvataḥ*.

Occasionally a similar remark applies to a verbal adjective: 1, 145, 3 *taturir yajñasādhanāḥ*: *sarvam hy eṣā pāpmānam tarati* (ŚB. 1, 8, 1, 22).

In 1, 68, 1 this form of brevity is due to haplology rather than ellipsis of the object: *pari yad eṣām eko viśveṣām / bhuvad devo devānām* (viz. *mahitvam*) *mahitvā*.

Not infrequently the non-expressed complement of a verb is a pronoun. Typical instances of brevity achieved by leaving a pronominal reference unexpressed occur e.g. 1, 18, 3 (“neither injurious speech nor harm . . . must befall us”) *rakṣā ṇo brahmaṇas pate* “protect us (from that), O B.”; 38, 8 *vāśreva vidyun mimāti | vatsam na mātā siṣakti (iyam vidyut marutaḥ sevate, S.; “ihn [viz. den Regen]”, cf. G.)*; 84, 5 *indrāya . . . | sutā amatsur indavo (viz. tam)*; 102, 6 *indraḥ . . . | janā vi hvayante*; 109, 4; 163, 7; 9; 164, 8; 182, 5; 2, 5, 5; 13, 3; 15, 4; 18, 4; 24, 1; 14; 33, 6; 34, 14; 3, 8, 5; 35, 1; 55, 5; 6, 14, 1; an indefinite pronoun: 1, 120, 7; in connection with a participle: 1, 51, 3 *adriṃ vāvasānasya* “den Fels des, der sich (darin) verbargt” (G.); in a simile: 6, 36, 2. In repeating a thought the pronominal object is not expressed in 1, 30, 16 *sa no hiraṇyatham daṃsanāvān | sa naḥ sanitā sanaye sa no 'dāt* “. . . he has given (it) to us”. Not infrequently however it seems to be the context and the meaning of the verb itself that render any complement superfluous: 2, 26, 2 . . . *subhago yathāsasi | brahmaṇas pater ava ā vṛṇamāhe*; 3, 37, 4; — 1, 36, 13 *vājasya sanitā yad . . . vāghadbhir vikvayāmahe*; for the author the aim of the contest was self-evident: “the winner of vāja when we contend (for it) with (the other) performers of a sacrifice”; 41, 9; 1, 137, 1 *susumā (somam) . . . adribhīḥ*.

The mood and position of the verb of the second sentence are not always irrelevant: 1, 124, 13 *astodhvaṃ stomyā brahmaṇā me | avivṛdhadvam uśatīr uśāsaḥ* admits of the translation “ye have been praised by my eulogy, so feel invigorated . . .”.

A participle or nominal case form which is translatable by an infinitive does not require a complement: 1, 152, 4 *prayantam it pari jāraṃ kanīnām | paśyāmasi nopanipadyamānam*, the complement of the second participle being sous-entendu; 1, 132, 5 *tasmā āyuh praṇāvad id bādhe arcanty ojasā*. Cf. also 4, 6, 7.

Another procedure consists in the apparent non-repetition of a demonstrative pronoun which makes, in another case form, part of the same sentence: 1, 68, 6 *tasmai cikitvān rayiṃ dayasva* “dem teile Reichtum zu, (dessen) einer gedenkt” (G.). Here also we should remember that the verb form, in casu *cikitvān*, is often used without a complement: see 1, 25, 11 *ato viśvāny adbhutā | cikitvām abhi paśyati*; 4, 29, 2. The correct translation may also be “allot property to him, being attentive, i.e. attentively”. Cf. also 6, 21, 11. But 1, 93, 8 stands for *tasya vrataṃ rakṣatam (tam) pātam amhasaḥ*; also 1, 104, 9. In other cases Geldner's insertions could better be dispensed with: 1, 131, 4. In 1, 68, 10 *vi rāya aurnod duraḥ* may not be considered an example of this phenomenon.

After verbs expressing will or intention a complementary infinitive expressing movement etc. is in many languages often omitted: Dutch *ik wil naar huis* (beside *ik wil naar huis gaan*) = Germ. *ich will nach Hause* <sup>124</sup>); and even: (Goethe) *er ist nach Ems und wollte mich auf's freund-*

<sup>124</sup>) “Ein Inf. lässt sich aus einem Verb. fin. ergänzen in der Wechselrede neben einem sog. Hilfsverbum, vgl. gehst du mit?: : ich musz, kann nicht, darf nicht”

*lichste mit sich*; Gr., Arist. Ran. 1279 ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν εἰς τὸ βαλανεῖον βούλομαι; Soph. Tr. 333 οἷ θέλεις; Cic. Att. 7, 4, 3 *ad urbem cogito*.<sup>125</sup>) It is as a rule quite unnecessary to alter the reading of the manuscripts in ancient writings if they exhibit a shorter text which is in harmony with well-known syntactic habits of languages of the same structure. Nor should we explain all relevant instances — which are ellipses, no brachylogy<sup>126</sup>) — as being due to the influence of military commands.<sup>127</sup>) This origin would, for instance, be highly improbable in cases such as *N 135 οἱ δ' ἰθὺς φρόνεον* “they were minded to go right onward”, the sense of the verb developing in similar passages from “to have in mind” to “to intend to go”.

As stated by Grassmann<sup>128</sup>) the verb *vaś-* “to will” is, in subordinate clauses, often used elliptically: 2, 24, 8 *yatra vaṣṭi pra tad aśnoti dhanvanā* “mit seinem . . . Bogen trifft (Brahmaṇaspati) dahin, wohin er will” (G.): *yasmīn viṣaye kāmāyate* (S.). As the complementary verbal idea occurs in the principal clause this place is a sous-entendu, and so are 1, 33, 3 *sam aryo gā ajati yasya vaṣṭi* where S.’s explication *pradātum kāmāyate* is preferable to G.’s: “zu ergänzen ist der nicht bildbare Inf. von *as-*”; 8, 66, 4 *karad . . . yathā vaśat: yena prakāreṇa prakāmāyate tathā sa eva karoti* (S.), and 8, 61, 4 *tathed asad . . . yathā vaśaḥ* where the verb is used absolutely; 8, 20, 17; 28, 4; 8, 93, 10 (see S.). Cf. also 2, 22, 1 (where S. explains *yathā taṃ somam akāmāyata tathāpibat*). In 2, 31, 7 *vaśmy* stands in a principal clause: *etā vo vaśmy udyatā* (sc. *vacāṃsi*, cf. 8, 101, 7), where S. is not right (*v. : kāmāye*): “I would wish that these . . . (words) please ye”; in st. 6 *uta vaḥ śamsam . . . smasi* a transitive inf. is wanting. See also 6, 15, 14. In 10, 38, 2 *vaś-* seems to be used absolutely.

At first sight there seem to be a considerable number of bracketed infinitives in Geldner’s translation. Here, however, appearances are deceptive, however interesting the phenomenon concealed behind these brackets may be. In 1, 57, 1 the poet states that Indra’s munificence is always “open” with a view to (his) *śavaḥ: rādho . . . śavase apāvṛtam*. Geldner is perfectly right in observing that *śavase* means “um seine Macht zu zeigen”. Here no ‘infinitive’ is to be supplied, the final dative itself admits of the translation given by the German scholar. In this ‘final dative’ the Vedic language has a means of expressing, by implication and in a concise form, what would, in our languages, require a word group or even a clause. The frequent use of these forms had no doubt contributed much to lending the relative passages a pregnant, concise, and lapidary character. Cf. also 1, 64, 12 *vṛṣaṇam saścata śriye* “an die bullige schlieszt euch an, um den

(Paul, Deutsche Gramm. IV, p. 358); cf. p. 362f. In Latin we find e.g. Plaut. Men. 435 *ei quantum potes*; Ter. Ph. 303 *non, non sic futurumst: non potest*.

<sup>125</sup>) See J. F. van Leeuwen, Aristophanis Ranae, Lugd. Bat. 1896, p. 189.

<sup>126</sup>) Thus R. Kühner-B. Gerth, Ausf. Gramm. der griech. Sprache, Satzlehre II<sup>4</sup>, Leverkusen 1955, p. 563f.

<sup>127</sup>) For another view see Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., p. 708, n. 1.

<sup>128</sup>) Grassmann, Wörterbuch 1226 f.

Vorrang (zu gewinnen)!" (G.), eleven words in the German translation, three in the original Sanskrit; 83, 6; 3, 2, 5; 53, 11. In 10, 28, 11 no word is wanting. That is not to contend that a case form which is equivalent to our infinitive may not be left out.<sup>129</sup>)

Returning to the participles it may be observed that they are not only often used so as to absorb a nominal concept — cf., in addition to the above examples: 3, 1, 23 *havamānāya* i.e. the singer; 4, 28, 5 *apihītāny aśmā* "die mit einem Stein verschlossenen (Schätze)"; 9, 97, 22 *venataḥ* "des schauenden (Sehers)" — they may also be omitted: 4, 7, 11 *tr̥ṣu yad annā tr̥ṣunā vavakṣa*, viz. "eating the victuals". In 1, 54, 5 no omission need be assumed; 3, 35, 1 is a case of sous-entendu. Absence of a verbal adjective (past participle) has for instance been assumed<sup>130</sup>) in 9, 86, 19 *indrasya hārdy āviśat manīṣibhiḥ* (viz. *pūtaḥ*) || *manīṣibhiḥ pavate* . . .; however "through the . . ." makes good sense and the beginning of st. 20 gives a welcome explanation.

A phenomenon of considerable frequency is the omission of an imperative. As a rule a sentence expressing a thought which may be converted into actuality and is spoken in a commanding or authoritative tone is apt to be understood as an order or injunction. In Dutch such monorhemes as *oppassen*, *uitkijken*, *voorzichtig*, *kalmte* are generally speaking meant and understood as injunctions. It is no doubt incorrect to consider with antiquated handbooks these expressions integrally elliptic. Greek examples are: *δεῦρο* "come here"; *ἄνα* (notice the accent!) "up! arise!", *N 95 αἰδώς Ἀργεῖοι*; in an inscription (Thera) it reads *οὐκ ἀποφορά* "carrying away not allowed!" In medieval Dutch sentences expressing an order or desire the verb is not infrequently suppressed: *gereet (=wes gereet) ten derde jare dijn gelof te bringhene hare*.<sup>131</sup>)

Thus an imperative expressing movement ("to come") is to be 'supplied' probably in ṚV. 1, 34, 8 *trir aśvinā sindubhiḥ* "three times, O A., with the rivers" (see S. and G.), and doubtless in 1, 35, 11 *tebhir no adya pathibhiḥ sugebhiḥ (āgatya S.)*; in 3, 30, 11 *antarikṣād abhi naḥ* . . .; 7, 70, 3. See also 1, 92, 16 *aśvinā vartir asmad ā*.

Injunctions<sup>132</sup>) to bring or to give are implied in 1, 117, 10 *yātam iṣā ca viduṣe ca vājam* "so kommet . . . und (bringet) . . ." (G.; *prayacchatam iti śeṣaḥ*, S.): the preceding imperative and the . . . *ca* . . . *ca* construction<sup>133</sup>) no doubt facilitated the understanding. Similarly 1, 44, 1; 141, 11 (cf. 10); 3, 30, 11; 53, 20; 5, 56, 1; 6, 16, 5. Cf. also 1, 184, 2 "hear . . . and (be) attentive".

An injunction to make is implied 1, 189, 3 *punar asmabhyam suvitāya*

<sup>129</sup>) Cf. also Geldner on 1, 112, 1. For the absence of an infinitive in other languages see e.g. Stoett, o.c., p. 150f.

<sup>130</sup>) Geldner, o.c., III, p. 81.

<sup>131</sup>) For other examples see Stoett, o.c., 's-Gravenhage 1923, p. 147f.

<sup>132</sup>) Cf. also H. Reichelt, *Awestisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg 1909, p. 353.

<sup>133</sup>) See my relative article in *Vāk 5* (Poona 1957), p. 1ff.

*deva* / *kṣām* . . . (S. otherwise: *prthivīm devayajanalakṣaṇām āgaccheti*), and 5, 20, 4 after *itthā* "thus". In 5, 31, 10 *vātasya yuktān* . . . "drive the teams . . ."; 68, 1 (to hear); 75, 8 (to pay attention to). In 2, 9, 6 *suvidatro asme* "(be) propitious . . .". An imp. of the 3rd pers. is absent in 1, 15, 7; 10, 1, 6.

An imp. is sous-entendu 1, 44, 1; 102, 3 *ratham* . . . *prāva* . . . / *ājā na indra* "[hilf] uns im Streit" (G.); 3, 4, 2; 1, 129, 10 *tvaṃ na indra rāyā*: 9 t. v. i. r. . . . *yāhi*; 4, 2, 11 is perhaps a slight zeugma; 1, 51, 8 is a case of ἀπό κοινοῦ: *śākī bhava yajamānasya coditā*. As already stated an imperative is not rarely 'wanting' in a clause containing a preverb-adverb: 1, 105, 14 *devāṃ achā viduṣṭarah* "(call) the gods hither . . ."; 129, 5; cf. 5, 7, 1. Occasionally S. prefers to supply an imp. where another construction would be possible: 1, 38, 15.

The same absence of an imperative may be found after *iha* "here": 5, 73, 2 *iha tyā* . . . "hierher (mögen) die beiden . . . (kommen)" (G.).

The absence of the verb after the interrogative *kuvid ānga* in 10, 131, 2 (cf. 8, 96, 10 k. a. *vedat*) is worth noticing.

In negative sentences the negative particle *way*, without a verb, suffice to express a prohibition or to indicate the speaker's wish that a process should not be performed, a thought should not be converted into actuality. Compare, in Greek Soph. Ant. 577 *μη̄ τριβὰς ἐτ'* (sc. *ποιήσητε*), ἀλλά νιν / κομίζετ' εἶσω "no more delays, but . . ."; O.C. 1441 etc. See RV. 1, 104, 7 *mā no akṛte purūhuta yonau* (sc. *dhāh* S.) "do not place us, O much invoked one, in an unprepared 'nest' ". It is open to doubt whether Geldner is right in recording 1, 173, 12 *mo su ṇa indrātra pṛtsu* "do not (viz. entangle) us, O I., in these contests" under aposiopesis, because in both Greek and Ancient Indian, constructions of *mā* without a verb are frequent enough, even in the literary documents which we possess: cf. e.g. ŚB. 14, 8, 13, 2 *mā prātrda* "not so, O P."; *maivam*.<sup>133a</sup> Cf. also 2, 28, 7 *mā no vadhair varuṇa* (*hiṃsīr iti śeṣaḥ*, S.); 1, 54, 1 *mā no asmin maghavan pṛtsu* (*pra-kṣaipṣīr iti śeṣaḥ*, S.) 173, 12; 2, 23, 16; 10, 100, 7. The verb is "insbesondere zu ergänzen wenn das Verb schon in einem entsprechenden positiven Satze enthalten ist"<sup>134</sup>): 7, 59, 12 *mṛtyor mukṣīya māmṛtāt*; 10, 22, 12.

Sometimes Geldner's translation creates the impression of an omission where there is, in my opinion, none. A literal translation of, for instance, 1, 38, 13 *achā vadā / jarāyai brahmaṇas patim* is "invoke B. with a view to old age"; that the German "dasz er das Greisenalter (uns schenke)" is perfectly adequate hardly needs mentioning, but the construction is for all that not defective.

Not all, but many cases of omission of a finite verb form<sup>135</sup>) or participle

<sup>133a</sup>) More examples may be found in the Petr. Dict. V, 680; for Greek see e.g. H. G. Liddell-R. Scott, A Greek-Engl. Lexicon, ed. 1948, 1124. For I.-E. *mē* in general see The character of the I.-E. moods, Wiesbaden 1956, p. 197ff.

<sup>134</sup>) Grassmann, Wörterbuch, 1027.

<sup>135</sup>) I also refer to Reichelt, Awestisches Elementarbuch, p. 352f.

may be ascribed to emotion, haste or the conviction on the part of the speaker that the hearer will understand the verbless utterance just as well. In conversational style, which abounds in abbreviations of various kinds, the 'tops' of the communication, some especially important words often suffice.<sup>136</sup> In Dutch *jij hier?* may mean: "how (or why) do you come here?" or "what are you doing here?". In exclamations, excited addresses and other emotional utterances the verb is very often omitted: cf. in Dutch *geen tijd!* beside the quietly informative *ik heb daarvoor nu geen tijd*, in French *heureux les pauvres en esprit!*; in Arist. Av. 274 οὔτος, ὦ σέ τοι! and Soph. Ant. 441 σέ δή, σέ τήν νεύουσαν ἐς πέδον κάρα; a verb "I say, I call" is to be supplied; cf. also Plaut. Bacch. 455 *fortunatum Nicobulum, qui illum produxit sibi*. The same brevity is often characteristic of formulas and idiomatic expressions: Soph. O.R. 430 οὐκ εἰς ὄλεθρον; Lat. *me dius fidius* (sc. *adiuvet*), etc.; Med. Dutch *so* (sc. *helpe*) *mi God*. In graphical descriptions the medieval Dutch writers often dropped the verbs: *eene erdbeve, die was soo groot, kerken, husen, lieden doot* lit. "an earthquake, that was so intense, churches, houses, people dead".<sup>137</sup> Similarly, in sentences expressing advice, a desire, order or command, etc. In other languages also the absence of the verb is a phenomenon of considerable frequency: (Loti) *toujours plus fort, ce grand souffle qui agitait toute chose*.

The absence of the copula<sup>138</sup> in descriptive passages and interrogations is a feature of frequent occurrence, in German: (Schiller) *rings um kein Busch, der mich verberge; wer da?; niemand da?*, in French: (Balzac) *c'est en bienfaisance, comme en poésie. Rien de plus facile que d'attraper l'apparence*; (Flaubert) *ces polissons-là, murmura l'ecclésiastique, toujours les mêmes*.<sup>139</sup> Too often students of archaic texts have overlooked that these have adopted and stylized syntactic features of the general colloquial language which, as to style and certain provinces of syntax seems to be, in all epochs and in all countries, fairly homogeneous.

A difficult problem arises when the relations are investigated into between these omissions in literary documents and the speech habits of the general public on whose language the literary usage of a given culture and epoch are ultimately based. Much depends on the literary genre, but it is an established fact that not all authors of, say, dramas, have the same preference for these omissions and abbreviations as for instance Terence who liked the 'ellipsis of the verb' much<sup>140</sup>): Ph. 100 *virgo ipsa facie egregia*; Andr. 361 *ego me continuo ad Chremem* "I went off straight to Ch."; Eun. 88 *ceterum de exclusione verbum nullum?* Verbs of saying, going, doing etc. are especially in the narrative parts of his comedies, often

<sup>136</sup>) See e.g. W. Kramer, *Inleiding tot de Stilistiek*, Groningen 1935, p. 40f.

<sup>137</sup>) See Stoett, o.c., p. 147f.

<sup>138</sup>) I also refer to Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 11f.; Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 244.

<sup>139</sup>) See e.g. F. Brunot, *La pensée et la langue*, Paris 1936, p. 18.

<sup>140</sup>) J. T. Allardice, *Syntax of Terence*, Oxford 1929, p. 2.



wanting. That in many points his 'ellipses' concur with those of the colloquial usage of his day may be taken for granted — cf. Andr. 907 *quid tu Athenas insolens* for "what brings such a rare visitor to A.?" This is however not to contend that this brevity is an offhand copy of the real conversational style of the man in the street. Authors may, in harmony with the exigencies of their genre, stylize and cultivate the speech patterns of the general language, they make their choice, and what they chose they adapt and integrate.<sup>141</sup>)

Among those R̥gvedic passages in which an indicative is, or seems to be, omitted, there are some which could perhaps be described as exhibiting a 'sous-entendu' in an extended sense of the term: 1, 66, 8 *yamo ha jāto yamo janitvam* "as Y. he has been born, as Y. (he creates) what is to be born". Elsewhere a complementary idea is to be supplied: 2, 30, 9 *yo naḥ sanutyō uta vā jighatnur* "if someone who acts furtively [sets traps for] us or if he wishes to kill [us]". For an unquestionable sous-entendu see e.g. 1, 30, 16; 131, 7 where *jahi* may perhaps be considered to stand ἀπό κοινῶ; 136, 2; 151, 4; 152, 4.

Elsewhere, however, the verb must be supplied by means of context and situation: 1, 30, 15 *ā yad duvaḥ . . . ā kāmam jaritṛṇām*, cf. 14 *ā . . . iyānaḥ*: "if thou, being invited (acceptest, agreeest)", the preverb being a representative of the verbal idea. The use of such an indeclinable element makes a nominal sentence possible also in 4, 6, 3 *ud u svarur navajā nākraḥ* and similar sentences. Even that element is often wanting: in 1, 46, 8 *aritraṃ vāṃ divas prthu | tīrthe sindhūnām rathaḥ* the first pāda is a nominal sentence, the second also although a verb for "standing" is to be supplied rather than the copula: "your oar is broader than heavens; your chariot is standing at the descent into the rivers". Cf. also 1, 57, 2 *apo nimneva savanā haviṣmataḥ* ("flow"). In 1, 54, 3 *puro haribhyām* presupposes a passive verb form "was yoked"; 1, 128, 5 *na hi śmā dānam invati vasūnām ca majmanā* ["he grants"]; 2, 31, 5 (cf. 9, 71, 1); 35, 14; 40, 4; 4, 11, 6; 6, 11, 2; 15, 7; 32, 5; 10, 5, 4; 48, 4; 49, 2. In 1, 6, 6 and elsewhere a participle of a verb may be supplied which occurs in other hymns of the R̥V.: *devayanto yathā matim*: cf. 1, 136, 1 *matim bharatā*; 143, 1 *matim . . . bhare*.

In view of the frequency of what German authors call 'Verbalellipse' in normal usage sentences such as R̥V. 3, 8, 10 *śr̥ṅgānīvec chr̥ṅgiṇām saṃ dadṛṣre | caṣālavantāḥ svaravaḥ prthivyām* "the sacrificial posts look like the horns of the horned (viz. animals), when they (are, i.e. they are standing) provided with their wooden rings on the earth" or 5, 45, 9 *ā sūryo yātu . . . kṣetraṃ | yad asyorviyā dīrghayāthe* "the sun must come . . . to the region which is far (i.e. extends over a long distance) on his long journey" do not appear to be unnatural. Nor does the ellipsis after *itthā* in sentences such

<sup>141</sup>) See also H. Haffter, Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache, Thesis Freiburg i. Br. 1934, esp. p. 130ff.

as 10, 44, 7 *itthā ye prāg upare santi* “geradeso (ergeht es denen), die . . .” (G.).

In the second of two co-ordinated sentences the verb, even when it is not ‘sous-entendu’, is in medieval Dutch texts often omitted: *nu waric gerne met hem bleven ende* (sc. *hadde*) *hem gehouden*; *nu latic van Rogarde staen ende* (sc. *sal*) *vort van Torec doen verstaen*. The same phenomenon recurs in Vedic stanzas, e.g. ṚV. 3, 22, 4 *aghayaḥ . . . / juṣantāṃ yajñam adruho* ‘*namivā iṣo mahiḥ*’: in the last pāda S. supplies *prayacchantām*. Cf. also 5, 60, 5; 7, 62, 1, and in a double relative clause: 10, 63, 1.

Counterparts of the habit of European authors to leave the verb of a subordinate clause out — cf., in German *wo ein gefährlich Amt, das heiszt man uns verwalten*; (Goethe) *was jedoch an dieser Sammlung am höchsten zu bewundern, war die Vollkommenheit*,<sup>142)</sup> and in French: *parce que filles du peuple, vous n’avez pas le droit d’être jeunes*; (Flaubert) *bien que philosophe, M. H. respectait les morts* — are not wanting: 3, 37, 9 *indriyāṇi śatakrato yā te jameṣu . . .*; 4, 17, 20 . . . *dheky asme adhi śravo . . . yaj jaritre*; 5, 52, 5; 6, 3, 8; 18, 13; 44, 3; 10, 23, 3; 61, 11. A subordinate participle is wanting in 10, 49, 6 and elsewhere.

In 5, 84, 3 *yat te abhrasya vidyuto / divo varṣanti vṛṣṭayah* the verb of the first clause is easily to be supplied. In 5, 79, 4 the root and general idea of the suppressed verb is likewise expressed by other words of the sentence. The absence of a verb of offering, executing, performing, granting, protecting or praising in well-known formulas, e.g. 5, 6, 11 *svāhāgnaye . . . haviḥ*; 5, 49, 4 *tan no anarvā savitā varūtham*; 6, 12, 6 and 49, 8 is easily intelligible. Cf. also 8, 2, 3 *indra tvāsmiṃ sadhamāde* “O I. (sc. I invite) thee to . . .”. Verbs of wishing, praying, etc. are apt to disappear: *good morning!* etc.; 5, 66, 3 *tā vām . . . / urviṃ gavyūtim eṣām* “(sc. we pray) ye both for . . .”. As already appeared from one of the other quotations the copula may be also absent when forms other than the 3rd pers. ind. are expected: 5, 18, 2.

The absence of the verb may result in a lapidary style suitable for the expression of profound thoughts and religious or mythical truths: 1, 68, 5 *ṛtasya preṣā ṛtasya dhītir* [the verb *cakruḥ* may be borrowed from the next line] / *viśvāyur viśve apāṃsi cakruḥ*; 105, 2 *artham id vā u arthinah*; 2, 13, 4; 3, 1, 11. A similar impressive brevity is achieved by suppressing a verb of saying or an indication of a change in the construction to direct speech: 1, 171, 4; 2, 33, 5; 3, 55, 1; 5, 66, 5; 6, 20, 8; 10, 18, 9; 23, 2. Cf. also 10, 34, 6.

A verb of considering is, in the first pers. sg. wanting: 5, 17, 2.

Brief, but not elliptic are clauses such as 1, 87, 5 . . . *jihvā pra jigāti cakṣasā* “the tongue moves through the eye” and 92, 3 *arcanti . . . / samānena yojanena parāvataḥ* where a verbal adjective (participle) seems to be missing; cf. also 130, 10 *sa no navyebhir . . . ukthaiḥ / . . . pāyubhiḥ pāhi*

<sup>142)</sup> Paul, o.c., IV, p. 369f.

“protect us therefore, through (i.e. strengthened by) new hymns, by means of thy protectors”; 3, 3, 6 *agnir devebhir . . . / tanvāno yajñam* “A., who performs the rite through the gods (i.e. incited by the gods)”; 1, 96, 2; 100, 16; 116, 24; 117, 4 etc.; 128, 6 *visvo vihāyā aratīḥ* (nominal sentence); 174, 5 *pra sūraś cakram vṛhatād abhīke* (“being near to it”); 178, 3; 2, 1, 1 *tvam agne dyubhis . . . / tvam vanebhyas . . . jāyase*; 2, 3, 4 and 5, 8 (nom. sent.); 16, 2; 33, 15; 2, 39, 1 I; 3, 6, 4; 52, 8; 54, 3; 58, 7; 5, 11, 2; 7, 62, 2. These verbless constructions are so frequent that the conclusion can hardly be avoided that they represent a characteristic, not only of this poetical Sondersprache, but also of the language of the general public on which this is founded.

Not infrequently the verb is missing in a vivid or emotional passage or in a graphic description: 1, 54, 10 *antar vṛtrasya jathareṣu parvataḥ* “der Berg (geriet) in den Leib des V.” (G.); 72, 8; 80, 7; 180, 1; 8; 184, 3 *devā nāsatyā vahatuṃ sūryāyaḥ* “the N. came to the wedding of S.”; 186, 1 (sous-entendu); 2, 1, 9; 5, 30, 8; 32, 5; or in a simile: 2, 34, 4. The occurrence of a dative expressing the aim of the process enables a poet to omit the verb and to achieve a remarkable brevity of diction: 1, 121, 2 *ṛbhur vājāya draviṇam naro goḥ* “als R. hat er . . . den Besitz der Kuh zum Siegespreis (bestimmt)” (G.); 4, 29, 5. In 2, 35, 3 no word has been omitted, the poet having succeeded in sketching the situation in a few meaning words: *sam anyā yanty upa yanty anyāḥ*, not “. . . münden andere (ins Meer)” (G.). Occasionally the absence of the verb may be due to ‘shortcomings’ in versification and composition: 1, 59, 4; — cf. also 1, 97, 2-5! — or lead to obscurity: 1, 121, 13; 2, 38, 5; 5, 74, 2. However for those who knew the language better than we will ever do these utterances might be intelligible even if no definite supplements were required: “qu’ajouterait-on pour restituer des phrases complètes et normales dans les exemples suivants: (Vogué) ils sont tous comme cela ici: des spéculatifs, des intelligences; tous des idées, mais rien de pratique; (Daudet) la noblesse, la fortune, l’argent, les titres, elle ne sortait pas de là. Et même quand on peut restituer, ne serait-il pas arbitraire parfois de le faire?”<sup>143</sup>) The omission may be due to an aposiopesis or other types of brevity in speech, made possible by the familiarity of the audience with the subject or the phraseology: 1, 71, 8 (cf. 10, 61, 6); 1, 88, 5 (cf. 5, 30, 2); 96, 2; 3, 8, 7; 5, 16, 2; 3; 42, 2; 64, 7. An interesting line is 7, 86, 5 *ava . . . na tāyuraṃ / sṛjā . . . vasiṣṭham* “set V. free (who is bound) like a thief”.

Geldner’s translation, here again, too often creates the impression of ellipsis or omission: cf. 1, 95, 10; 174, 9; 2, 11, 1; 5, 10, 4; 16, 4; 6, 17, 14 (the datives: “with a view to . . .”); 20, 6; 7, 87, 3; 10, 1, 7; 18, 7; 93, 1.

The precise combination in which a word could, in those ancient times, occur are of course very imperfectly known. We cannot therefore always comprehend how far a more or less usual phrase or word combination

<sup>143</sup>) Brunot, La pensée et la langue, p. 18.

could be shortened without becoming unintelligible to those who spoke the language. What is however certain is that definite epitheta, similes etc. could by supplying omission or deficiencies essentially add to the intelligibility of a sentence. A collection of all relevant passages would therefore be not devoid of interest. In 5, 41, 12 *nabhas tariyāṃ iṣirah pariṃjā* refers no doubt to the wind (*vātaḥ*) which combines with *pariṃjā* in 7, 40, 6; *p. vātaḥ*.

There are also other constructions which should not be included in a survey of the various types of ellipsis proper. Sometimes Ṛgvedic sentences are decidedly brachylogical. By brachylogy is here intended that conciseness in speech which is characterized by the omission of one or more words which are essential to a logically correct or complete expression of thought or to the immediate understanding. The line Hes. Op. 515 *καί τε διὰ ἔνοῶ βοῶς ἔρχεται, οὐδέ μιν ἴσχει* "he goes even through an ox's hide; it (viz. the ox's hide) does not stop him" is not elliptical, because no part of a normal construction or usual phrase has been omitted. *οὐδέ μιν ἴσχει* is in itself perfectly correct and complete. The subject however changes without any indication of change, so that the correct interpretation of the communication is left to the intelligence of the listener, who is expected to pass over an unevenness. Ṛgvedic instances are: 1, 62, 8 *virūpe . . . yuvati | kṛṣṇebhir aktoṣā ruśadbhir | vapurbhiḥ* "two young women different in form (viz. Night) whose figure is imbued with dark colours, Dawn with bright". Whereas the absence of *vapurbhiḥ* after *kṛṣṇebhiḥ* should be considered a case of sous-entendu, that of "Night" is a brachylogy. In explaining 1, 135, 2 *tubhyāyaṃ somaḥ paripūto adribhiḥ* Sāyaṇa observes: *adribhir abhiṣuto dasūpavitraśodhanena grahaṇena vā śodhitah*, "s.v.a. von den Steinen ausgepreszt und durch die Seihe geläutert" (G.). In the second half 5, 77, 2 *prātar yajadhvam aśvinā hinota | na sāyam asti devayā ajuṣtam* a subject "offering" (*yajñah*) is to be borrowed from *yajadhvam* in the first clause (cf. S.: *haviḥ*). Cf. also 5, 50, 2. Uncertain: 5, 47, 1.

Typically brachylogical are also sentences such as 1, 120, 8 *mākuṭrā no gr̥hebhyo dhenavo guḥ | stanābhūjo aśiśviḥ*: the author does not intend to ask that only those cows which have milk without having calves will be safe, but he prays for their safety and for their productivity: as is often the case an adjective amplifying an otherwise complete sentence is thrown into relief and often 'equivalent to a subordinate clause'<sup>144)</sup>

In similes and comparisons<sup>145)</sup> brachylogy is, in the Ṛgveda, much more frequent than in other passages. Often one of the terms of the simile has been omitted so as to necessitate the hearer's supplying it from the other complementary clauses. Thus in 1, 130, 3 *ver na garbham parivītam*

<sup>144)</sup> See my treatise on amplified sentences, Disp. Rheno-Traj. III, 's-Gravenhage 1959, p. 43 ff.

<sup>145)</sup> I also refer to A. Bergaigne, M.S.L. 4, p. 96 and especially to Renou, Ét. véd. et pāṇ. I, p. 39 ff.

*aśmani* means "hidden in the rock like the brood of the bird <in the egg>". Similes may indeed be grammatically correct and complete, yet felt as incomplete or even as unintelligible to the uninitiated. Thus 1, 38, 14 *mimāhi ślokaṃ āsye | parjanya iva tatanah* "measure the rhythmic sounds (of your songs) in your mouth, sustain them like P. <rain, i.e. keeps on raining>" finds its explanation in 8, 21, 18 *parjanya iva tatanad dhi vṛṣṭyā* and compare S.: *parjanya iva, yathā meghe vṛṣṭim vistārayati tadvat*. Cf. also 4, 30, 2. It may be true, that often a mere reference to a comparison could suffice because the audience understood what was the meaning of the stanza and the intention of the poet,<sup>146</sup> there is on the other hand no denying that this stylistic habit which often goes to the utmost limit of comprehensibility — and sometimes, at least in our eyes, even beyond — was a factor in the 'mystic' and 'esoteric' function to be fulfilled by the mantras. In reading stanzas such as 10, 115, 3<sup>147</sup>) one can moreover hardly escape the impression that the poet attempts to present a recapitulation of a number of comparisons and descriptive epithets which were more or less traditional, borrowing and abridging them so as to fit in with one another, that is to say: so as to constitute a stanza. Other examples are: R.V. 1, 30, 2 *ed u nīmnaṃ na riyate* "he (Soma) flows like <water> to low grounds": *yathā nīmnapradeśam āpaḥ āpnuvanti tadvat* (S.); 41, 9; 52, 4 (cf. 5, 85, 6 etc.); 2, 27, 5 *pari śvabhreva duritāni vṛjyām* "mochte ich die Abwege wie <ein Wagenfahrer> die Spalten vermeiden"; 34, 13 *te kṣoṇībhir aruṇebhir nāñjībhi | rudrah* "the sons of R. . . <like the dawns>"; 2, 12, 5 *so . . . puṣṭir vija ivā mināti* "he diminishes the possessions . . . like <a gambler> the stake"; 29, 5 *mā mādhi putre vim iva <vyādhaḥ, S.> grabhīṣṭa*; 3, 14, 3; 5, 9, 3; 17, 3; 52, 15; 67, 3; 6, 1, 3; 7, 4; 20, 8; 8, 41, 8, where the subject of the clause containing upamāna (the comparison proper) is omitted; and 1, 64, 11; 83, 2; 186, 7 *tam im giro janayo na patnīh . . . nasanta*: supply: *patim*; 2, 29, 5; 3, 1, 14; 36, 7; 38, 1 *abhi taṣṭeva dīdhayā manīṣam*; 4, 6, 2; 5, 9, 6; 54, 4 *vi yad ajrām ajatha nāva im yathā* <the water>; 1, 162, 17; 5, 9, 5; 10, 29, 5 where the omission affects the object.

This phenomenon may be accompanied by the sous-entendu of another element. An example is: 1, 53, 1 *nū cid dhi ratnaṃ sasatām ivāvidat* "for never has anyone found the jewel like (a thief) <the jewel> of those who sleep": *drṣṭāntaḥ: yathā svapatām puruṣāṇām dhanam coraḥ kṣipram labhate tadvat*.

Another type of condensed simile may be exemplified by 1, 23, 11 *jayatām iva tanyatur | marutām eti dhṛṣṇuyā* "ungestüm ergeht der Marut Donner wie (der Donnerruf) der Sieger": here the governing element of the nominal word group is not repeated in the clause containing the simile. With regard to 1, 57, 1 *apām iva pravane yasya durdharam rādhaḥ* "whose

<sup>146</sup>) Thus Renou, o.c., p. 40 who also recalls the śleṣas of the classic epoch.

<sup>147</sup>) See also Renou, l.c., and especially Geldner's references to more complete parallel places: o.c., III, p. 339.

liberality is irrestrainable like (the stream) of water in a declivity” (*jalānām vegah*, S.), G., on the strength of 9, 67, 7 *sindhora iva pravane* (cf. 6, 46, 14), considered the possibility that the simile has been incorrectly formulated. A determinant noun is however not infrequently wanting. Needless to observe that a substantive may also in the upamāna be ‘replaced’ by a qualification: 1, 59, 4; 112, 2; 144, 6; 186, 5; 8, 43, 17 or to add that here also “those concerned” or (French) *on* may be considered the subject: cf. e.g. 1, 92, 5: *svaram na peśo vidatheṣv [aśret] añjan / citram divo duhitā [añjati] bhānum aśret*.

The element to be supplied may be neither subject nor object: 3, 9, 4 *anv im avindan . . . / apsu siṃham iva śritam* “they found him who had recourse to the waters like a lion <to a hiding-place>”; 3, 18, 1; 33, 10; 5, 32, 10, cf. 4, 6, 4.

Two elements of the clause expressing the upamāna are wanting in 5, 9, 4 *purū yo dagdhāsi vanāgne paśur na yavase* “who is a burner of much wood, as cattle on the pasture <eat much grass>” (cf. also 6, 2, 9); 1, 114, 9; 127, 11 *svīryam mathīr ugro na śavasā* “. . . like a mighty one <produces fire> with power”; 155, 1; 10, 59, 1; 1, 190, 4 is very briefly worded and rather obscure: *atyō na yamsad . . . vicetāh*; should we supply *devān*, and in the upamāna *ratham* and a verb? <sup>148</sup>) There are also more complicated instances: 1, 112, 2 *yuvor dānāya subharā(h)* (viz. the gifts, enjoyments) / *ratham ā tasthur vacasaṃ na* <the inspiration, thoughts, *dhīyah*> *mantave*. Two elements in the upameya are missing in 2, 34, 12.

Sous-entendu rather than brachylogy: 1, 116, 9.

There is no need to follow Geldner always: a translation of 2, 18, 8 *asmabhyam asya dakṣiṇā duhita* may for instance be clear without inserting the bracketed words: “für uns soll seine D. <wie eine Kuh> ergiebig sein”. In 6, 2, 1 *śravo . . . puṣṭim na puṣyasi* there is no omission; in 1, 55, 2 *viśritāh* viz. *dhārāh somasya?*; 1, 164, 15 no simile.

Sometimes the omission of an element affects the clause containing the upameya (i.e. that which is compared): 4, 5, 1 *stabhāyad (dyām, S., G.)* <sup>149</sup>) *upamin na rodhaḥ*; 8, 103, 11 *duṣṭarā yasya pravane normayaḥ* which may mean: “his <flames> are difficult to be passed like the waves in the torrent”.

The construction exemplified by 1, 71, 10 *nabho na rūpaṃ jarimā mināti* lit. “old age destroys (i.e. changes) the outward appearance like a cloud” in which the subject of the comparison, the upamāna proper, is expressed alone, no doubt goes back to a widespread popular turn of speech in which for reasons of economy <sup>150</sup>) the behaviour of a person or object, an event or phenomenon are compared to another being or occurrence the relevant characteristics of which are supposed to be known to

<sup>148</sup>) See Oldenberg, *R̥gveda Noten*, I, p. 186; Geldner, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 271.

<sup>149</sup>) See Geldner, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 424.

<sup>150</sup>) See e.g. Havers, *Handbuch*, p. 289, s.v. Sprachökonomische Tendenzen. Cf. also the observation made by O. Jespersen, *Efficiency in linguistic change*, København 1941, p. 72f.



the audience: in English, *you speak like a fool; he behaves like a madman*. In these popular constructions the verb is as a rule not repeated<sup>151</sup>) (sous-entendu). Very often similes of this type are not only illustrative in character, but also intended as intensive additions: AV. 6, 142, 2 *ucchrayasva dyaur iva* (to the grain) "rise up like the sky". These exaggerations are very natural, not only among the illiterate, but also among educated people when they go into raptures.

Mention must be made also of: RV. 1, 113, 8 *vāyor iva sūnṛtānām udarke* where the 'tertium comparationis', which in all probability is the idea of swiftness,<sup>152</sup>) is left unexpressed: "when the *sūn.* arise like the wind"; for this type compare also 1, 169, 4 *rayiṃ dāḥ . . . iva rātim* "wealth <as much> as a grant"; 3, 45, 3 *kratum puṣyasi gā iva* "du hegest Weisheit . . . <viel> wie die Kühe" (G.); 6, 46, 13 *śyenām iva śravasyataḥ* "who run after fame like falcons": cf. our more or less colloquial or popular phrases, in Dutch, *lopen als een haas* lit. "to run like a hare"; in English *to swim like a rat*, etc. The type represented by the parenthetic *avanayo na rathāḥ* in 1, 186, 8 "like rivers (their) chariots" qualifying the speed of the Maruts may be compared to the colloquial (Dutch) *een kerel als een boom* which means "a man (as) tall as a tree"; *haring als zalm; een man als een mes*; (Engl.) *eyes like stars* etc. Cf. 9, 52, 3 *carur na yas . . .* "who is (full) like a pot"; 2, 39, 5.

Turning now<sup>153</sup>) to some other types of brevity in connection with similes attention may be drawn to the absence of the verb in 1, 57, 2 *āpo nimneva savanā haviṣmataḥ* "like water into the depth the soma libations of him who offers", where a verb of "running, flowing" has been omitted: a structure which no doubt is based on a brisk conversational style. — In 8, 24, 9 the principal clause following a *yathā* clause includes neither *evam* nor a verb.

Very common is a sous-entendu type of simile in which the counterparts of one or two elements of the clause containing that which is compared are expressed, but the verb which both clauses have in common is omitted. Instances are: 1, 3, 8 *ā ganta tūrṇayaḥ | usrā iva svasarāṇi* "do thou approach quickly as the cows to their pastures"<sup>154</sup>); 34, 7; 37, 8 etc.

Sometimes the verb is to be taken in a double sense: 10, 1, 7 *ā hi dyāvāpṛthivī agna ubhe | sadā putro na mātārā tatantha: tan-* "to spread, be diffused, shine over" and "to propagate": this reminds us of the zeugma.

Special attention may be invited to those instances in which in both clauses an element is, from the point of view of logical syntax, missing. When 1, 70, 10 it reads *pitur na jivrer vi vedo bharanta* these words must mean: "they distribute <thee, i.e. Agni> as <the sons> the possessions of a decrepit father", S. combines *vedaḥ* also with "thee": *tvatto viśeṣeṇa haranti*

<sup>151</sup>) See Remarks on similes in Sanskrit literature<sup>2</sup>, Leiden 1949, p. 18f.

<sup>152</sup>) See Geldner, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 150.

<sup>153</sup>) For 'incomplete similes' see also Grassmann, Wörterbuch, 220f. (*iva*); 702 (*na*).

<sup>154</sup>) See Venkatasubbiah, Vedic Studies, I, Mysore 1932, p. 82.

*grhṇantīty arthaḥ*; it is however fire itself that is distributed. Similarly 1, 127, 2 *parijmānam iva dyām hotāram carṣanīnām*, probably with G. “the hotar of the peoples who, like <the sun> the sky goes round <the sacrificial ground>”; 190, 4. Cf. also 1, 168, 3, where the subject of the upamāna is indicated by a female adjective: *aṃseṣu rambhīṇīva rārabhe*, the subject of the upameya may be guessed. Hence such instances as 1, 92, 5 which are remarkable by a certain complication of their structure: *svaruṃ na peśo vidatheṣv [aśret] añjam / citraṃ divo dukhitā [añjatī] bhānum aśret* (cf. Sāyaṇa); the distribution of the elements of the sentence over both pādas contributes much to its understanding. In 1, 173, 10 the verb of the upamāna and the object of the upameya are missing. Otherwise interesting: 1, 133, 6; 5, 58, 7; 84, 2.<sup>155</sup>)

Those similes in which the particle of comparison *iva* or *na* was wanting or omitted were already in the Nirukta 3, 18 considered a distinct type, called *luptopamā*. They are very numerous and in places such as 7, 63, 3 not always clearly discernible because the text admits of another interpretation: *eṣa me devaḥ savitā cachanda*, translated by G. “er erscheint mir <wie> Gott S.”, may also mean “er gilt mir als G. S.”; cf. also 1, 94, 15 where *adīte* probably is an epithet of Agni (Nir. 11, 23); 52, 9; 116, 7; 2, 3, 8; 7, 69, 1. Some examples are: 1, 54, 4 *śītām gabhastīm aśanim* “the hand, sharp like a thunderbolt” (“offenes Kompositum”, G.); 88, 4 *grḍhrāḥ pary ā va āguḥ* “<like> vultures they went round . . .”; 96, 5 *dyāvākṣāmā rukmo antar vi bhāti*; 4, 4, 2 *tapūṃsy agne juhvā patamgān / . . . vi srja . . .*; 8 *saṃ te vāvātū jaratām iyaṃ gīḥ*, and in addition to the above: 1, 27, 6; 71, 3; 186, 3; 191, 10; 2, 43, 1; 3, 15, 6; 36, 2; 4, 38, 2; 5, 1, 7; 6, 19, 9; 27, 6; 10, 82, 1. As is well known the same absence of *iva* occurs in post-Vedic texts; see e.g. Kāl. R. 6, 58. A survey of the relevant stanzas may show us that it is not rarely impossible to draw a hard-and-fast line between comparison and identification.<sup>156</sup>) In colloquial usage a man is called a *Croesus*, a *Landru* (a notorious murderer) instead of “as rich as C.; like L.”. In an emotional letter of thanks an honest and simple soul wrote that his benefactors had been *fathers and mothers* to him. So Agni may 2, 10, 1 *sa vājī* have been briefly called a race-horse — the word *vājī*—however literally means “a bearer of *vaja*—” — although 1, 60, 5 etc. the particle of comparison is added. Cf. also 1, 74, 8; 2, 32, 3; 5, 32, 8; 6, 45, 26; 8, 1, 10; 10, 94, 5. This brevity results from a vivid imagination and a preference for graphicalness. Since Indra is 1, 51, 1 called a “sea of goods” he may 3, 51, 2 be briefly identified with a sea: *satakratum arṇavaṃ śākinam*; 1, 55, 2 however it reads: *so arṇavo na . . .* Elsewhere one might be tempted to consider the poet’s communication one of the mystic identifications in which especially the brāhmaṇas abound 5, 31, 5 (*grāvānah*) . . . *ye pavayo . . . indreṣitāḥ* “the pressing-stones tires instigated

<sup>155</sup>) For 10, 103, 1 see Renou, o.c., I, p. 41.

<sup>156</sup>) See also Renou, o.c., p. 40.

by I.” (cf. e.g. ŚatBr. 3, 5, 4, 24; TS. 1, 4, 1, 1 these stones are requested to make the sacrifice deep, with their edge (*pavi-*)).

The problem as to how far the particle *na* when put, not after, but before the word to which it belongs — e.g. 10, 21, 1 — may indicate that an element of a comparison has been omitted, was recently touched upon by Renou.<sup>157)</sup>

Sāyaṇa occasionally drew attention to the *luptopamā*; part of the relevant places were also discussed by Geldner.<sup>158)</sup> Thus 1, 116, 7 *kārotarūc chaphād aśvasya . . . / śataṃ kumbhām asiñcatam surāyāḥ* “<as they pour > [spirituous liquor] from a wine-cask ye poured a hundred jars of liquor from the hoof of the horse”: *luptopamam etat : yathā surāyāḥ saṃpādakāḥ tāṃ śrāvayanti evam eva yuvām . . . aśvasya khurāt . . .* With regard to Agni and the horse (see above) he observes on 4, 15, 1 that the words *agnir . . . / vājī san pari nīyate* should, by way of *luptopamā* mean, *śighragāmī voḍhāśva iva tathā devebhyo havir vāhakaḥ*, cf. AitBr. 2, 5, 3 *vājīnam iva hy enam santam pariṇayanti*. RV. 7, 18, 8 *paśus kavir aśayac cāyamānaḥ : paśur iva . . . aśeta* (S.); 33, 10 *vidyuto jyotiḥ pari saṃjihānam : vidyuta iva* (S.); 9, 3, 3, *eṣa devo* (Soma) . . . / *harir vājāya mṛjyate : aśva iva* (S.). Compare e.g. also his commentary on 8, 1, 10<sup>159)</sup> . . . *dhenuṃ dhenurūpam indram . . .*

We need not however always follow the Indian commentator: 1, 125, 4 *upa kṣaranti sindhavo . . . dhenavaḥ* may be interpreted as an asyndeton and zeugma “to (him) flow the rivers, the milchcows”, but S. (on TS. 1, 8, 22, 4) prefers explaining these words as follows: “the cows will flock towards him like rivers”.

An interesting type of ‘brachylogy’ is the so-called *comparatio compendiaria*, some fine examples of which occur in Homer *P* 51: *αἰματί οἱ δέοντο κόμαι Χαρίτεσσιν ὁμοίαι* “his hair was drenched in blood, that was like <the hair of> the Graces”; δ 279 *πάντων Ἀργείων φωνῆν ἴσκουσ' ἀλόχοισιν* “making her voice like <the voice of> the wives of all the A.”; compare also in Medieval Dutch: *sijn hooft es ghelijc den aer, maar sijn lichame es ghelijc den leu* “his head is similar to the eagle (i.e. to the head of the eagle), but his body is similar to the lion”.<sup>160)</sup> This idiom is a sub-type of the frequent turn of speech Φ 191 *κρείσσων αἶτε Διὸς γενεῆ ποταμοῖο τέτυκται* “so is the offspring of Zeus, too, more mighty than <the seed of> a river”; Cic. Ph. 11, 9 *quis est qui possit . . . conferre vitam Treboni cum Dolabella* instead of *cum vita Dolabellae*. That is to say: an equivalent of our “that of”, Fr. *celui de*, Dutch *die van* was not used.<sup>161)</sup> It is therefore incorrect

<sup>157)</sup> See Oldenberg, Z.D.M.G. 61, p. 815; Renou, o.c., I, p. 41.

<sup>158)</sup> Geldner, Der Rigveda in Auswahl, II, Stuttgart 1909, see p. 241, s.v.

<sup>159)</sup> See Geldner, RV. in Ausw. II, p. 120.

<sup>160)</sup> See e.g. E. Bruhn, Sophokles erklärt von F. W. Schneidewin und A. Nauck, VIII. Anhang, Berlin 1899. This construction was also ‘permitted’ in classical Latin (see e.g. Cic. Or. 230): cf. J. Lebreton, Études sur la langue de Cicéron, Paris 1901, p. 95.

<sup>161)</sup> It may be recalled to memory that “avant que celui eût pris possession de

to regard these constructions <sup>162</sup>) as ellipses. If appearances are not deceptive they were in ancient times normal, however brachylogical they may be in the eyes of those who have become conscious of the logical incompleteness and inaccuracy and who have become accustomed to the use of the longer turn. If the longer variant is usual, the shorter may, from the synchronic point of view, be considered a brachylogy.

Ṛgvedic instances of the comparatio compendiaria are 1, 58, 2 *atyō na pṛṣṭham pṛṣṭitasya rocate* “(Agni’s) back gleams like <that of> a stallion when he is sprinkled (with ghee)” ; and perhaps 1, 91, 3 *rājño nu te varuṇasya vratāni* if this pāda may be taken separately so as to mean “thy vows are <like those> of king V.” ; 9, 64, 9. In this connection passing mention may also be made of the types of brevity exhibited by 5, 10, 5 *svāno ratho navājayuh* “ihr Getöse ist wie <das des> wettfahrenden Wagens” ; 1, 37, 5 *pra śamsā goṣv aghnyam* “praise (the host of the Maruts) which (so to say is) the bull among the cows”.

In studying similes from this point of view attention should also be invited to the fact that many similes are by themselves a means of achieving a certain brevity of expression: 1, 129, 5 “as quick as the kindling sticks (which are, one should know, quick at flaming up)”.

In considering 1, 56, 3 *dudhra ābhūsu* a case of ellipsis one would probably be mistaken. The meaning being “impetuous or obstinate with regard to the interests of his supporters or adherents” or something of the same tenor, the locative seems to denote concern, reference, or a disposition towards somebody.<sup>163</sup> If Geldner is right in interpreting “in (Sachen seiner) Anhänger hartnäckig” the phrase may represent a case of the so-called persona pro re construction. This is a widespread economical device applied in popular usage as well as, in certain turns of speech, in standard language and literary works.<sup>164</sup> In Dutch *ik ga achter* lit. “I am slow” may mean *mijn horloge gaat achter* “my watch is slow”, cf. in French *vous retardez*. The other day a railway-guard said *bent U al geknipt* “are you already punched?”, meaning “has your ticket already been punched?”, and in German cloakrooms the expression *Bitte, hängen Sie sich da auf!* seems to be not unknown. Thus we speak in Dutch of *een Rembrandt* instead of “a painting by R.”; and we possess *the complete Shakespeare*, i.e. his complete works. Consisting in the replacement of a thing by the person who is its owner or has, more generally, in some way or other relations with it and in asserting something of the person that logically should be

---

son rôle moderne, on disait, comme en latin: ses raisons sont meilleures que ses adversaires, ou bien . . . que de ses . . .” (Brunot, o.c., p. 732). After the attempt made by those who wished to make the written language more logical, to repeat the noun, the demonstrative *celui* came into use: . . . que celles de . . .

<sup>162</sup>) E.g. with A. Ernout–F. Thomas, *Syntaxe latine*, Paris 1951, p. 192.

<sup>163</sup>) Speyer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, Leiden 1886, p. 112, § 149.

<sup>164</sup>) See also Havers, *Handbuch*, p. 165f.; 204; Th. Kalepky, *Zs. f. franz. Spr. u. Lit.* 41 (1913), p. 257f.; 44 (1917), p. 243.

predicated of the thing, this type of brachylogy was readily adopted by great poets: Verg. Aen. 2, 311 f. *iam proximus ardet Ucalegon*; Hor. Carm. 1, 35, 22 *nec comitem (= comitis munus) abnegat*,<sup>165</sup> where Kiessling-Heinze were right in observing that "der persönliche konkrete Ausdruck (is used) für die Abstraktion".<sup>166</sup> Many instances of this type of brachylogy must have originated in the language of more or less limited groups of persons or under circumstances which preclude misunderstanding.

Interesting Vedic parallels are ṚV. 1, 129, 10 *ratham kaṃ cid . . . / anyam asmad ririṣeḥ* "thou mayst ruin any chariot other than us (i.e. than ours)"; 4, 16, 11 *todo vātasya* instead of "driver of Vata's horses".

The existence of a special type of brevity in speech in connection with prepositions for "after" has attracted the attention of classical scholars<sup>167</sup> who justly observed that e.g. Tac. Ann. 4, 40 *post Drusum* means *post matrimonium Drusi*, and Σ 96 *ἀντίκα γάρ τοι ἔπειτα μεθ' Ἑκτορα* (sc. *θανόντα*) *ποτμος ἐτοῖμος* "for immediately after Hector's death is your own death sure to come", although the shorter "i. a. Hector is . . ." is, also in our languages perfectly intelligible. A similar brevity is *Anno Domini* which stands for "in the year (of the, or after the, birth) of our Lord". In this construction a member of a word group is omitted and its case form or syntactic construction are given to the remaining term of that word group. Geldner is probably right in supposing *rajasi* in 2, 2, 4 to stand for *budhne rajasaḥ* which occurs in st. 3: "(3) the gods have appointed him (Agni) at the bottom of space . . . (4) him who grows in (the b. of) s. . .".

The term *breviloquentia* may be reserved for that brevity in speech or literary expression which replaces longer expressions by shorter, e.g. compounds by simple nouns, without resorting to ellipsis. When, in 1, 151, 1 it reads *mitraṃ na yaṃ . . . goṣu gavyavaḥ . . . jījanan* "den wie einen Freund die Rinderbegehrenden . . . (im Kampf) um die Rinder . . . erzeugten" (G.), the word for "cows" refers to a well-known conflict in connection with cows. Similarly, 6, 32, 3. In 5, 1, 3 *dakṣiṇā yujyate* the poet means "the vehicle of the d.", cf. 1, 123, 1 *ratho dakṣiṇāyā ayoḥi*. In 8, 6, 34 *kaṇvāḥ* is used instead of "the hymns of the Kaṇvas".<sup>168</sup> According to G.<sup>169</sup> *hāriyojana-*, the technical term for a special soma-graha, which constitutes the end of the soma ceremony when Indra is supposed to harness (*yuj-*, *yojana-*) his bay steeds (*hari*), is in 1, 61, 16 "mit Bre-

<sup>165</sup> See also E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, I<sup>2</sup>, Lund 1956, p. 247f., where many interesting examples are quoted.

<sup>166</sup> A. Kiessling-R. Heinze, *Q. Horatius Flaccus Oden und Epoden erklärt*<sup>5</sup>, Berlin 1908, p. 160 (with parallel instances).

<sup>167</sup> See P. Persson, *Brachylogische Ausdrücke bei post und μετά*, *Eranos* 20, p. 58ff.; J. Svennung, *Orosiana*, Thesis Uppsala 1922, p. 2f. Similarly, with *ante* Verg. Aen. 11, 424.

<sup>168</sup> See Geldner, o.c., II, p. 297.

<sup>169</sup> Geldner, o.c. I<sup>2</sup>, p. 80.

viloquenz auf Indra bezogen". Not infrequently a complement to a verb though usually added really is a superfluity, which may be omitted without detracting from the intelligibility of the communication. Thus the poets of the ṚV. left out any indication of the reason or purpose for which a chariot was put in readiness: 1, 48, 7 *eṣāyukta parāvataḥ* "sie hat (zur Fahrt) aus der Ferne angespannt"; 7, 75, 4; cf. 8, 3, 17.

Occasionally a gerund or verb of a subordinate clause might be 'supplemented' for the sake of clearness: 1, 122, 6 *śrutam sadane viśvataḥ sim* lit. "do ye (Mitra and Varuṇa) listen, on your seat, to it (i.e. my speech) to the end", i.e. "listen, when ye have taken your seat . . .".

Local adjuncts are sometimes left unexpressed where we would expect to be informed about the particular place where the process described happened: 1, 148, 3 *pra sū nayanta* "they brought (him, sc. Agni, to the fire-place)"; similarly 4, 1, 9; 2, 24, 6. Here also the tendency not to add a complement to a verb is obvious. The greater familiarity of the poets and their audience with the subjects dealt with allowed them to be brief where we would add some details: 1, 83, 6 *barhir . . . vṛjyate*; 119, 4; 8; 130, 3; 167, 6 *āsthāpayanta yuvatim yuvānaḥ* (i.e. the Maruts) "the young man caused the young woman to mount (their chariot)"; 2, 24, 6; 10, 38, 10. Explanations such as are given by Geldner in 1, 4, 8; 27, 7; 81, 1 have nothing to do with this topic.

In the same way and for similar reasons the occasion on which an event took place is not always indicated: 1, 151, 2.

Though briefly worded 8, 2, 36 is no example of 'breviloquentia'; in 8, 8, 3 and 7 no participle is missing.<sup>170)</sup>

The remarkable recurrent *evayāmarut* in 5, 87 is 'Satzparenthese' rather than an instance of that brevity of speech which is discussed here: (2) . . . *ye ca nu svayam pra vidmanā bruvata — evayāmarut*. The brevity of 5, 52, 11 *pāravatā iti citrā rūpāni darsyā* "ihre wunderbare Gestalten werden sichtbar (, bei denen man sagt): Leute aus der Fremde!" (G.) is by no means unidiomatic: the verb of speaking, thinking etc. is often not expressed, *iti* alone being the exponent of the direct construction.<sup>170)</sup> With regard to 4, 1, 1 *viśvam ādevam janata pracetasam* "den ganz Götterfreundlichen erzeugt . . ." G. hazards the suggestion that *viśvam* is an abbreviated *viśvadevam*. I rather would recall a phenomenon which is too familiar to require many illustrations, viz. the structure *eine ganze alte Frau*, instead of *eine ganz alte Frau*; cf. e.g. It. *tanta grande alterazione*; Fr. *une fenêtre toute grande ouverte*, Gr. (Thuc.) *ἐν πάσῃ πολεμίᾳ Σικελίᾳ*.<sup>172)</sup> Similarly 1, 128, 6.<sup>173)</sup>

<sup>170)</sup> Otherwise Geldner, o.c., II, p. 302.

<sup>171)</sup> For examples see Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, p. 384f.

<sup>172)</sup> Cf. e.g. K. Brugmann, Grundriss d. vergl. Gramm. d. indogerm. Spr., II<sup>2</sup>, 2, Strassburg 1911, p. 665f.; W. Havers, Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax, Heidelberg 1931, p. 76; 228.

<sup>173)</sup> Otherwise ṚV. 2, 18, 7 though quoted by Brugmann, l.c.



Returning for a moment to the 'Kurzformen' or curtailed compounds — cf. in French *vélo* < *vélocipède*, in Germ. *Bahn* < *Eisenbahn*; *Ober* < *Oberkellner* etc.<sup>174</sup>) — it may be observed that this form of brevity is also represented in the R̥gveda. In 1, 26, 7 Agni is described as a *hotā mandraḥ* lit. "a pleasant hotar" which must mean here "a pleasant-tongued hotar": for *mandrajihva*- cf. 5, 25, 2; 6, 16, 2 etc.; 1, 37, 6 *anta*- instead of *vastrānta*-. In 5, 32, 8 *aṛṇam madhupam* seems to stand for *aṛṇapam m*. Perhaps also 1, 4, 7 *patayat*: *patayatsakha*-.<sup>175</sup>)

Not all simplicia occurring beside compounds which are of considerable frequency are however to be considered curtailed forms: thus *vītaye* in 1, 5, 5; 3, 13, 4 instead of the usual *devavītaye* is rather an instance of a term of a more general sense in the vocabulary of a limited milieu pre-occupied by common interests; cf. also *tvac*- in 1, 28, 9 as opposed to *adhīśavaṇam carma* in AiBr. 7, 32, 4. It is also questionable whether *rathān* and *yogān* in 2, 8, 1 are "Abkürzungen" (G.) for *rathayogān* (ŚB. 14, 7, 1, 11) or 'pars pro toto'. Has *tigmena* (*vṛṣabheṇa*) in 1, 33, 13 arisen from *tigma-śṛṅgeṇa* (cf. 10, 48, 10 etc.)? for *tigma*- cf. also 6, 3, 4. R̥V. 1, 7, 5 *vṛtreṣu* is breviloquentia rather than "Kürzung" for *vṛtrahatyēṣu* (G.); cf. 1, 131, 3 *svaḥ* instead of *svarṣātīm*.<sup>176</sup>)

Mention may also be made here of the madhyamapādalopī compound<sup>177</sup>) in which the middle member of a compound is omitted — a (+ b) c, cf. in German *Sonnabend*, *Ölberg*, in Dutch *luchtgevaar*, *melkstaking* —, e.g. 3, 8, 7 *kṣetrasādhasaḥ* which, if literally meaning "who promote, finish, direct the landed property", may be explained, with G., "die <den Streit um> den Grundbesitz schlichten"; however "who conquer, acquire l. p. (for their adherents)" is not impossible.

We now come to that brevity of speech which is commonly called zeugma, i.e. that 'figure of grammar' in which a verb or adjective is applied to two nouns, to only one of which it is strictly speaking applicable either grammatically or logically. Although in Latin *gerere* is not as a rule accompanied by *pacem* Sallustius, B. J. 46, 8 wrote *pacem an bellum gerens*. The phenomenon which is not foreign to colloquial usage should not be considered an artificial device,<sup>178</sup>) although it may be true that the poets, for the sake of versification, readily availed themselves of this possibility of omitting a word. Geldner is probably right in considering 1, 35, 4 *kṛṣṇā rajāṃsi taviṣīm dadhānaḥ* an instance of this procedure: "den schwarzen Dunst (verbreitend), seine Stärke anlegend"; cf. also 54, 1 *akrandayo nadyo roruvad vanā* "du machtest die Flüsse aufkreischen, (du knacktest) laut brüllend die Bäume" (G.), where notwithstanding st. 5 *ni yad vṛṇakṣi . . . vanā* the assumption of a zeugma is the more probable solution of the

<sup>174</sup>) See e.g. Brugmann, o.c., II, 1, p. 41 ff.

<sup>175</sup>) See Grassmann, Wörterbuch, 764.

<sup>176</sup>) For *svaḥ* 1, 52, 9 see Geldner, o.c. I<sup>2</sup>, p. 67.

<sup>177</sup>) For this type of compound see Vāmana, Kāvyaḥ. 5, 2, 15.

<sup>178</sup>) Thus Renou, Ét. véd. et pān. I, 34.

difficulty. Other examples are: 1, 23, 11 *jayatām iva tanyatur* / [*tanyatur*] *marutām eti dhṛṣṇuyā*; 86, 2 *yajñair vā yajñavāhaso* / *viprasya vā matinām*; 89, 4 *tan no vāto . . . vātu . . .* / *tan mātā pṛthivī tat pitā dyarūḥ* [*vātu*]; 90, 6 *madhu vātā ṛtāyate* / *madhu kṣaranti sindhavaḥ*; 113, 1; 2, 2, 10; 40, 4; 5, 14, 4; 54, 14; 8, 2, 11; 20, 5; cf. also 3, 7, 10. ṚV. 8, 20, 19 *yūna ū ṣu . . .* / *gāya gā iva carakṛṣat* “‘praise’ the youth (i.e. the Maruts) in song, just as the ploughman (drives) the bulls (by strengthening and persuasive words)” is interesting in that it shows the relationship between ‘hymns of praise’ and encouraging and invigorating speech of the ordinary man. In 1, 92, 17; 6, 2, 11 and similar sentences there is no zeugma.

Occasionally we should rather speak of an aposiopesis: 1, 112, 8 *yābhiḥ śacībhir . . . parāvṛjam* (viz. renders assistance to . . .) — / *prāndham śronam cakṣasa etave kṛthāḥ*. Renou<sup>179</sup>) is no doubt right in warning against the inclination to assume too many instances of this device; Geldner — whose German translation sometimes creates the impression of a zeugma, where there is none (e.g. 5, 2, 4) — himself was indeed often in doubt: see e.g. 2, 4, 6.<sup>180</sup>) Passages such as 6, 25, 3 are rather to be regarded as elliptical. The preference for nominal constructions may, in translating, lead to instances of pseudo-zeugma: cf. 1, 101, 3 with G.’s translation. ṚV. 1, 31, 14 *pra pākam śāssi pra diśaḥ*<sup>181</sup>) “du belehrest den Unerfahrenen, du (gibst) Weisungen” (G.): *śās-* admitting of ‘a double accusative’, there is no zeugma. The use of a verb of general meaning (e.g. *kṛ-*) enabled a poet to avoid a zeugma: 1, 161, 11; 5, 14, 4. ṚV. 1, 174, 5 *vaha kutsam . . . aśvā* is no zeugma, because *vahati* takes both objects; cf. also 1, 30, 15 and probably 10, 1, 7. A curious instance of a verb which is in the same stanza to be taken intransitively and transitively occurs 1, 105, 8 = 10, 33, 2 *sam mā tapanty abhitāḥ* / *sapatnīr iva parśavaḥ* “es schmerzen mich allenthalben die Rippen wie die Nebenfrauen (den Mann quälen)” (G.).<sup>182</sup>)

Many places which may at first sight impress the reader as elliptical are actually examples of the phenomenon called “Wort- oder Satzhaplogie” or “Dissimilation ganzer Wörter”<sup>183</sup>): “ganze Wörter werden verschluckt (more correctly: may be omitted), wenn ihnen das gleiche Wort folgt oder vorausgeht”<sup>184</sup>); however, cases in which two identical terms are separated by one or more other words are not very infrequent. In judging the instances — which, if we would follow Geldner, are rather numerous — one should bear in mind that, in normal speech, this type of

<sup>179</sup>) Renou, o.c., p. 33f.

<sup>180</sup>) ṚV. 2, 27, 12 may be explained otherwise.

<sup>181</sup>) See also Oldenberg, Ṛgveda, Noten I, p. 30.

<sup>182</sup>) Cf. Geldner, o.c., III, p. 182.

<sup>183</sup>) See e.g. A. Debrunner, Dissimilation ganzer Wörter, Mélanges de ling. et de phil. offerts à Jacq. v. Ginneken, Paris 1937, p. 67ff. (with a bibliography); J. Gonda, Dissimilation de mots entiers, Acta orientalia 21, p. 267ff. (Sanskrit instances).

<sup>184</sup>) K. Geldner, in Festgabe—A. Kaegi, 1916, p. 102, who was one of the first scholars to draw attention to this interesting phenomenon.

brevity is, generally speaking, due to inattentiveness or haste, to the tendency called perseveration or anticipation — an element of the utterance continues to preoccupy the mind of the speaker to such a degree as to interfere with the normal choice or succession of words, syntactic or grammatical structure, etc. of the other parts of the utterance—<sup>185</sup>) and to other causes of what is commonly known as ‘slips of the tongue’. In daily parlance this type of omission is apt to crop up even in the utterances of otherwise correct and accurate speakers and in writing it may happen to the best author. What is however curious is the considerable number of places in the Vedic mantras which may, more or less convincingly, be made more clear and ‘complete’ if this phenomenon is, now and then perhaps as a *deus ex machina*, supposed to have ‘mutilated’ the text. Was this dissimilation so common in Vedic times, that these poets could reproduce — or should we say: utilize — this type of dissimilation so freely? That sometimes a type of dissimilation becomes more or less fixed or usual may be regarded as certain — remember the German *lasz uns davor hüten* instead of *lasz uns uns d. h.*<sup>186</sup>) — ; that however one corpus should exhibit so many examples of a considerable variety as is believed by Geldner<sup>187</sup>) is at first sight surprising. The very fact of their occurrence may probably be explained from the co-operation of various factors: the frequency of other types of brevity and ‘omission’, the imperfect powers of the authors in constructing sentences which meet the requirements of a logically and grammatically correct syntax, difficulty in expressing their thoughts and the necessity or desirability to keep close to the rules of versification. In short, they may for various reasons have adopted a syntactic ‘irregularity’ which, when it happens too often, is a characteristic of an inaccurate speaker.

R̥gvedic instances of haplogical omission affecting identical words are, or rather may perhaps be, inter alia, 1, 100, 13 *divo na tveṣo ravathaḥ* instead of *divo na ravathaḥ t. r.* “like the roaring of heaven (thunder) (is his) roaring”: the question may however arise whether this short structure which no doubt could suffice by itself did not represent a more or less normal type of sentence. The literal Dutch translation: “zijn geluid was als van de hemel” would be perfectly intelligible.<sup>188</sup>) Is it necessary to hold, with Geldner,<sup>189</sup>) that in 1, 52, 5 *bhinad valasya paridhīmr iva tritaḥ* “he destroyed the enclosures of Vala like T.” the word *p.* is to be “thought

<sup>185</sup>) R. J. A. Lagas, *Syntactische perseveratie- en anticipatieverschijnselen*, Amsterdam 1942.

<sup>186</sup>) “Wenn von einem Verbum finitum und einem davon abhängigen Infinitiv derselbe Kasus eines Pronomens abhängig zu machen wäre, begnügt man sich öfters mit einfacher Setzung” (Paul, o.c., IV, p. 358f.) Vgl. also Stoett, o.c., p. 152.

<sup>187</sup>) See e.g. Geldner, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 147, n. 3 (but 3, 25, 5; 5, 23, 4?).

<sup>188</sup>) For French *ses raisons sont meilleures que de ses adversaires* see Brunot, o.c., p. 732.

<sup>189</sup>) Geldner, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 66.

doubly"? R̥V. 1, 141, 6 *bhagam iva papṛcānāsa ṛñjate*, translated: "sie lassen ihm den Vortritt wie die, die (ihr Glück) gemacht haben, dem Bhaga" may however be explained as follows: "they reach after (him, so as to exert influence) like those who have increased (in prosperity) with regard to Bhaga" ("sie haben Einfluss (auf ihn) wie die, die ihr Glück gemacht haben, auf Bhaga (der Glück gibt)"<sup>190</sup>); 5, 59, 7 *antān divo bṛhataḥ <divaḥ> sānunas pari*; 1, 163, 5 as *imā śaphānām <nidhānā> sanitur nidhānā*, but "of the hooves, of the winner" seems preferable. R̥V. 5, 4, 4 *yatamāno raśmibhiḥ sūryasya* "(an Glanz) mit den Strahlen der Sonne wetteifrend" (G.) has nothing to do with dissimilation.

The terms involved in the process are different case forms of the same noun or stem, or derivatives of the same stem or root: 1, 26, 9 *athā na ubhayeṣām | <amṛtānām> amṛta martyānām | mithaḥ santu praśastayaḥ*; 128, 6 *viśvo viḥāyā aratir vasur <vasu> dadhe haste . . .* ". . . hält der Gott (die Güter) in seiner . . . Hand" (G.); the difficult pāda 1, 143, 3 *chātvaḥsasato aty aktur na sindhavaḥ* was considered corrupt by Oldenberg<sup>191</sup>) who proposed to read *aty aktūn* ("über die Nächte"), less unconvincingly Geldner: "Worthapologie für *aty aktum aktur*"; 2, 35, 14 *āpo <apām> naptre gṛtām annam vahantīḥ* "the waters bringing ghee as food to <apām> Napāt"; 3, 36, 7 *madhvaḥ punanti <dhārā(h)> dhārayā pavitraiḥ* (cf. 9, 7, 2); 4, 8, 8 *<viṣo> vipras . . .*; 20, 1 *oḥiṣṭhebhīr <ṛbhī> ṛpatīḥ*; 5, 1, 8 *mṛjyate sve <dame> damūnāḥ*; 6, 1, 12 *ṛvad <vasu> vaso . . . dhehy asme*; 23, 9 *taṃ vaḥ <sakhāyaṃ> sakhāyaḥ*; 24, 9 *gambhīreṇa na uruṇā <amatreṇa> amatrin | preṣo yandhi*<sup>192</sup>); 7, 60, 1 *vayaṃ devatrādīte <aditayaḥ> syāma*; 8, 51, 9 *tiraś cid <aryo> arye . . . so aḥyate rayiḥ* (cf. 8, 33, 14); 10, 8, 9 *avābhinat satpatīr <satpatīm> manyamānam*. Perhaps also 5, 15, 5,<sup>193</sup>) but 1, 60, 3 may be explained without the assumption of a haplological omission. See also Geldner on 1, 112, 18; 10, 7, 1. Cf. also 2, 1, 5 *tava <gnā(h)> gnāvo . . . sajātyam* "<the women> are, O thou who art accompanied by the divine women, . . . thy company". As *āhuta-* "into whom an oblation has been poured out" occurs also without the complement *gṛtena, gṛtaiḥ* (cf. e.g. 2, 8, 2) 5, 8, 6 *gṛtāyonim āhutam* should not be considered to stand for *gh. <gṛtaiḥ> ā.*; similarly 5, 11, 3. In 7, 91, 2 *uśantā dūtā na dabhāya gopāḥ* no double *na* (1st "like", 2nd "not") is necessary. Cases such as 2, 23, 16 *ā devānām ohate vi vrayo [ohate]* are rather to be regarded as a 'sous-entendu'.

A syllable seems to have been dropped by dissimilation in 7, 6, 1 *vande dāruṃ*: *vande (van)dāruṃ vandamanaḥ*.<sup>194</sup>)

Occasionally both terms are neither formally or semantically identical

<sup>190</sup>) For the meaning of *ṛñj-* see the present author's paper on I.-E. *rēḡ-* and the root *reḡ-*, in *Zs. für Vergl. Sprachf. (K.Z.)* 73 (1956), p. 158ff.

<sup>191</sup>) Oldenberg, *R̥gveda Noten*, I, p. 145.

<sup>192</sup>) See also Grassmann, *Wörterbuch*, 90.

<sup>193</sup>) See Geldner, *o.c.*, II, p. 16.

<sup>194</sup>) Geldner, in *Festgabe Kaegi*, p. 106.

nor etymologically related: 1, 61, 7 *mahaḥ pitum papivāñ cārv annā* instead of *m. <pituh> p. p. c. a.* "he has drunk the drink of his great <father>, his dear food": cf. 3, 48, 2 *mahaḥ pitur dame*; 5, 86, 3 *prati . . . / gavām <eṣe> . . . eṣate* (cf. 10, 48, 9 *gavām eṣe*); 10, 111, 7 <*yat* conjunction> *yat* (participle). In 5, 25, 7 no word for "great" (*mah-* etc.) need be supplied after *mahiṣīva*.

Is 1, 168, 5 an example of disappearance, through dissimilation, of a word which was to occur at a great distance from its first occurrence: *ko vo 'ntar marutaḥ . . . / rejati tmanā hanveva <antar> jihvayā?*<sup>195</sup> See also 5, 3, 10 *kuvid devasya sahasā . . . / <devānām> sumnam agnir vanate* (?). An uncertain instance admitting of explication or supplementation occurs 2, 37, 6.

Sometimes the term ἀπό κοινῶν would give a better indication of the character of the omission. Although this term also has found various applications<sup>196</sup> it is advisable to limit its use to those cases in which sentences, clauses or word groups which are not connected by conjunctions have one element in common which is placed in the middle of these sentences etc. and which is grammatically to be connected with the preceding as well as the following part of the utterance so as to form a unity with both of them.<sup>197</sup> Some German examples are: *also ward ver-breiset Jerusalem die stat grosz ward von volk alle blosz; man hörte dir zu lob erklingen gloria in der kirchen singen; unlang zeit dor noch gezogen kom für den künig geflogen ain vogel*. In the RV. 7, 34, 5 may likewise 'stand for' *abhi pra sthātākeva yajñam / <yajñam> yāteva patman tmanā hinota*: "zu *hinota* nochmals *yajñam* zu denken".<sup>198</sup> In 8, 9, 21 *yan nūnam dhībhīr aśvinā / pitur yonā niśidathaḥ* the gen. *pituh* belongs to *dh.* as well as *y.* Both members of the simile in 1, 117, 5 may be considered to form an ἀπό κοινῶν construction . . . *rukmaṃ na darśatam nikhātam / <nikhātum> ud ūpathur . . .* Also 7, 48, 1: *ā vo 'rvācaḥ <kratavo, viz. mama> kratavo na yātām / . . . ratham . . . vartayantu*. An interesting line is 10, 55, 2 II where the insertion of a second *priyam* would not only clarify the sense, but also 'rectify' the metrum. Cf. also 1, 116, 24, and, possibly, in enjambment, 1, 131, 7 *tam . . . martyam <jahi> / jahi yo . . .*; 1, 55, 6 *ojasā*<sup>199</sup>; cf. also 4, 2, 14 (*rtam*); 9, 95, 5 (*vācam*).

The sous-entendu is a phenomenon of as frequent occurrence in the

<sup>195</sup>) Cf. Geldner, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 245.

<sup>196</sup>) An incorrect example was e.g. given by J. Marouzeau, *Lexique de la terminologie linguistique*, Paris 1933, p. 30: il croit à son étoile et que tout lui réussira: this is a 'sous-entendu'. Not any simplification of something double (Havers, *Handbuch*, p. 173) is an ἀπό κοινῶν construction!

<sup>197</sup>) Compare the definition given by O. Behaghel, *Deutsche Syntax*, III, Heidelberg 1928, p. 534, and his explanations on p. 536; see also H. Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, Halle S. 1920, p. 138 ff.

<sup>198</sup>) Geldner, o.c., II, p. 214.

<sup>199</sup>) Not with Ludwig and Oldenberg, *Rgveda Noten*, I, p. 78, 1, 77, 1.

Ṛgveda as it is elsewhere: Germ. *Wilhelm reist morgen nach Köln, ich nach Bonn*. Often — but by no means always — the well-known tendency to repeat the same thought more or less literally or to subjoin a parallel utterance to a short sentence has led the poets to omit in the second part of the system an element which was included in the first: 1, 101, 3 *yasya vrata varuṇo yasya sūryaḥ*; 127, 10 *agre . . . jarata ṛsūṇām | jūrñir hota [agre] ṛsūṇām*; 129, 11 *avayātā sadam id durmatinām | devaḥ san [avayātā] d.*; 162, 16 *yad aśvāya vāsa upastrñanty | adhivāsam yā hiraṇyāny asmai [upasta]*; 1, 102, 2 *asya śravo nadyaḥ sapta bibhrati | dyāvākṣāmā pṛthivi darśataṃ vapuḥ*; 112, 1. The preposition *ā* is not repeated 1, 151, 5 *ā nimruca uśasaḥ*. Other examples are: 1, 34, 5; 129, 9; 131, 3; 135, 1; 5; 3, 31, 12; 5, 7, 10; 6, 17, 14; 46, 1. Compare also 1, 25, 21 *ud uttamam mumugdhi no | vi pāsam madhyamaṃ cṛta | avādhamāni* [viz. *mumugdhi* or *cṛta*] *jīvase* and the sous-entendu of the copula in the imperative: 1, 34, 1 *triś cin no adyā bhavataṃ navedasā | vibhur vām yāma uta rātir aśvinā*.

ṚV. 1, 9, 2 is an instance of a sous-entendu in a second sentence which is an 'inverted' restatement of the former: *em enaṃ sṛjatā sute | mandim indrāya mandine* "lasset ihn los auf den Presztrank, (lasset) den berauscheden für den rauschliebenden Indra (strömen)". Cf. also 5, 87, 2. In a system expressing reciprocity the second verb is sous-entendu: 1, 26, 7 *priyo no astu viśpatir | . . . | priyāḥ svagnayo vayam*. Sous-entendu is also the indication of the agens or intermediary in 1, 18, 8 *c ād ṛdhnoti haviskṛtim | . . . | hotrā deveṣu gachati* "and he causes the preparation of the oblations to be successful . . . , the oblation <sup>200</sup> comes to the gods (through him)".

Non-repetition of a relative pronoun e.g. 5, 77, 4 (but 4, 7, 1 is an instance of asyndeton); of a demonstrative 1, 27, 8; of an interrogative 4, 25, 2.

The 'omission' concerns a term in another number: 1, 119, 2 *dhitiḥ*: [*dhitayaḥ*]; in case form: 1, 22, 17 *tredhā ni dadhe padam | samūlham asya pāmsure* [sc. *pade*]; 122, 1 *rudrāya . . . | [tam]*; 5, 58, 6; or another form of the preceding verb: 5, 12, 3 *vedā me deva ṛtupā ṛtūnām | nāham patiṃ [veda]*; 6, 22, 2. Special mention may be made of 5, 52, 5 where *ṛbhyaḥ* seems to be sous-entendu in connection with *divaḥ . . . nara . . . | pra yajñam yajñiyebhyo | divo arcā marudbhyaḥ*; as however the phrase *divo naraḥ* occurs in connection with the Maruts 1, 64, 4; 2, 36, 2 etc. the expression is at the same time elliptical. The sous-entendu is reiterated in 5, 13, 1 *arcantas tvā havāmahe | arcantaḥ sam [tvā] idhīmahi | agne arcanta [tvā] ūtaye*; 6, 9, 6. A word occurring in the last sentence but one is omitted in 1, 28, 9 *uc chiṣṭam camvor bhara | somam pavitra ā sṛja | ni dhehi (śiṣṭam) gor adhi tvaci*. The omission occurs in another (the next) stanza: in 1, 25, 6 *kṣatram* is to be 'borrowed' from st. 5 *kṣatrasṛiyam*; 129, 10; 6, 22, 2. The verbal idea is — if I am not mistaken — to be repeated after a parenthesis in 3, 22, 3. As appears from 2, 23, 14 a member of a compound may be sous-entendu in the next sentence: . . . *dṛṣṭavīryam | āvis tat kṛṣva yad . . .*

<sup>200</sup>) Renou, *Ét. véd. et pān.* IV, Paris 1958, p. 29.



where Sāyana observes: *yat vīryam*. Cf. also 3, 1, 10 *sapatnī . . . sabandhū / . . . manuṣye* “[wives]”. Geldner may be right in ‘supplying’ *tvastuḥ putram* after *tvāstṛam* in 2, 11, 19.

A complicated instance occurs in 1, 68, 4 which according to G.<sup>201</sup>) must be interpreted as follows: *bhajanta viśve devatvaṃ [daivam] nāma / ṛtaṃ sapanto amṛtam [nāma] evaiḥ*.

After a longer first clause, a shorter, yet complete second clause is followed by one in which the verb is omitted; in the last clause both verb and relative pronoun are sous-entendu: 1, 112, 20 *yābhiḥ . . . / bhujyuṃ yābhir avatho, yābhir adhrigum, / omyāvatim . . . / tābhir . . .* Two elements are also to be supplied in sentences such as 1, 38, 2 *kva vo gāvo na raṅyanti* “where do they take pleasure in you like the cows [t. p., viz. in pastures]?”; the pastures do not however occur in the preceding part of the utterance; 121, 3 in two parallel thoughts. Compare also 6, 16, 13 (object and verb); 1, 112, 4. An interesting complicated instance occurs 6, 9, 2: *nāhaṃ tantuṃ [vi jānāmi] na vi jānāmy otuṃ / na [v. j. tantuṃ] yaṃ vayananti . . .* Cf. also 1, 141, 11.

Occasionally a term is to be supplied which is semantically speaking only related to that occurring in the former part of the system: 1, 36, 10 *yaṃ tvā devāso manave dadhur . . . / yaṃ kaṇvo* “thou (i.e. Fire), whom the gods placed at Manu’s disposal . . . , whom K. [kindled]”. Cf. also 1, 92, 1<sup>202</sup>); 139, 2; 146, 1 (cf. 10, 5, 3); 5, 79, 8. In 5, 59, 8 *astu* may in a nominal sentence be ‘supplied’ after *mimātu*.<sup>203</sup>)

We shall not enter here into discussion of the ultimate origin of these sous-entendus or contracted sentences. The assumption that “in the beginning” the word wanting was always repeated does in my opinion not seem to be any more provable than the view that appositions originated in complete sentences: I for one cannot follow Schwyzer<sup>204</sup>) in holding that for instance the Greek *I* 450 f. ἀτιμάζεσκε δ’ ἀκοιτω, μητέρ’ ἐμήν once meant “er behandelte entehrend seine Ehefrau — die war meine Mutter” or “er entehrte seine Ehefrau, er entehrte meine Mutter”. The occurrence of complete sentences in other languages — e.g. ’s *Marili, so g’heiszt mis chlinst* in the dialect of Zürich, which is equivalent to the standard German *Mariechen, mein jüngstes Kind* — is in itself no argument in favour of the supposition that similar expressions were the source of the shorter constructions. The structure *ι* 140 f. ῥέει ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ, / κρήνη ὑπὸ σπείους may in some cases have occurred beside the type ῥ. ἀ. ὕ. ῥέει κ. ὕ. σ. and represent a brachylogy; but nominatives were so often loosely connected with sentences and nominal concepts which were either themselves or represented by pronominal substitutes in the proper case-forms, part of

<sup>201</sup>) Geldner, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 89.

<sup>202</sup>) For 1, 64, 9 see Geldner, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 85.

<sup>203</sup>) For the nominal sentence see Renou, Gramm. véd., p. 357, 1. 2ff.

<sup>204</sup>) Ed. Schwyzer, Zur Apposition, Abh. Deutsch. Akad. d. Wiss. Berlin, ph.-h. Kl., 1945/6, 3, p. 8ff.

sentences were so often made to precede a sentence (nominativus pendens)<sup>205</sup>) that it would be strange if it could not follow also.

A remarkable type of sous-entendu consists in omitting an element in a previous part of the utterance where it might have occurred while mentioning it in the next clause or sentence. Repetitions of clauses or word groups of the type 1, 128, 2 are not rare in the Ṛgveda: *yam mātariśvā manave parāvato / devam bhāḥ parāvataḥ*, but this instance is remarkable in that the verb is postponed to the second part of the utterance “whom M. [conveyed] for M. from afar; the god whom he conveyed from afar”. The tendency to express oneself in parallel utterances of a limited length led the poet to distribute the elements of the statement *y. d. m. m. p. bh.* over two pādas and to repeat the word *p.* Cf. also st. 3 . . . *reto vṛṣabhaḥ kanikradad / dadhad retaḥ kanikradat*, where *dadhad* must be supplied in the first and *vṛṣabhaḥ* is sous-entendu in the second part of the utterance. Otherwise: st. 4 [*yataḥ*]. Other instances occur: 1, 38, 10; 2, 2, 6; 5, 50, 3; cf. 2, 23, 16 *ā devānām [vrayo] oḥate vi vrayo ḥṛdi*; also outside parallel schemes: 2, 14, 9; 6, 24, 1; chiasmus 6, 4, 8 *tā [rāsi] sūribhyo gṛñate rāsi sumnam*. Occasionally the verb of the first unit is omitted: 1, 183, 5 *yuvām gotamaḥ purumīḥo atrir / dasrā havate avase haviṣmān*, where the preterit of *hū-* is to be supplied in *y. g.* etc. A more complicated instance occurs 1, 187, 5 *tava tye pito dadatas / tava svādiṣṭha [svādmānaḥ] te pito / pra svādmāno [tava] rasānām / . . .* Cf. also 1, 190, 4.<sup>206</sup>)

There are parallels in other languages, e.g. in M.H. German: (Wolfram) *swā līt und welsch gerihte lac* “wo welches Recht gilt und galt”; occasionally also in later German: (Logan) *Gott wird den Himmel neu und schaffen neu die Erde*.<sup>207</sup>)

Some other curious instances of the ‘omission’ of a term before its occurrence in a later word group or clause are 1, 139, 1 *yad dha [nābhiḥ] krāṇā vivasvati / nābhā samdāyi navyasī*; 140, 11 *sudhitam [manma] durdhitād . . . manmanaḥ*; 1, 135, 9 *dhanvañ cid ye anāsavo / jīrā(ś) [gīrau] cid agiraukasaḥ*: we would prefer mentioning the mountains first and repeating them by the substitute “there”. In 1, 169, 1 a verbal idea is to be supplemented in pāda a, the corresponding nominal occurring in b: *mahaś cit tvam indra yata etān / mahaś cid asi tyajaso varūtā*; the pāda is to be taken as a sous-entendu rather than, with G., as an aposiopesis. The caesura shows, in 1, 138, 1, that *mahitvam* is omitted in the first sentence, not in the second. Cf. also 10, 18, 11. Chiasmus: 1, 46, 9. Two elements of the sentence are to be understood from what follows: 2, 38, 7; *ibid.* 8 *viśvo mārtaṅdo vrajam ā paśur gāt* “every bird [went to its nest],<sup>208</sup>) the

<sup>205</sup>) See W. Havers, *Der sog. Nomin. Pendens*, I.F. 43 (1926), p. 207ff.; *Zur Syntax des Nominativs*, Glotta 16 (1928), p. 94ff.; J. Gonda, *Defining the nominative*, *Lingua* 5, p. 288 ff.; *Nominatives joining or ‘replacing’ vocatives*, *ibid.* 6, p. 89ff.

<sup>206</sup>) For 2, 17, 2 see Geldner, *o.c.*, I<sup>2</sup>, p. 297.

<sup>207</sup>) Cf. Paul, *Deutsche Gramm.* IV, p. 358.

<sup>208</sup>) Geldner, *o.c.*, I<sup>2</sup>, p. 326 otherwise.

cattle went to the cow-pen". It is evident that the parallelism is a substantial aid in understanding this kind of aposiopesis.

Structures such as 1, 123, 7 do not belong here: *apānyad ety abhy anyad eti / viṣurūpe ahanī sam carete*, notwithstanding G.'s: "die eine [Tageshälfte] geht, die andere kommt . . .", the former part being an autonomous prelude. Cf. also 2, 24, 5. Otherwise 1, 155, 3.

One can hardly escape the conviction that the formulaic character of the diction of these mantras and the exigencies of versification stimulated the poets to resort to a procedure which in itself was natural.

A more general term may be supplied in the last member of a system: thus in 1, 43, 3 *yathā no mitro varuṇo / yathā rudraś ciketati / yathā viśve* [viz. *devāḥ*] *sajośasaḥ*. A nominal idea is in translating to be borrowed from a verbal idea expressed in the preceding part of the stanza in 5, 85, 4 *sam abhrena vasata parvatāsas / . . . śrathayanta* [viz. *vāso*] *vīrāḥ*.

Special mention may be made of the non-repetition of pronominal forms in contexts such as 1, 60, 3 *tam . . . sukīrtir . . . aśyāḥ / yam ṛtviḥjo . . . praya-svanta(h) . . . jñjananta* "zu ihm . . . möge der . . . Lobpreis dringen . . . , den die . . . Priester . . . erzeugt haben, [für ihn] die Lobe bereit haltend": the idea of "offering libations" is expressed by an adj.; this sous-entendu is regular. See also: 1, 61, 2; and 159, 3 *te sūnavah . . . jajñur mātārā pūrvacittaye*, where the subst. *p.* is in the usual way left without any indication of the 'pronominal complement': "these sons generated the parents in order to be remembered first" ("dasz man [ihrer] zuerst gedenken soll", G.); 2, 18, 4 *ayam sutah . . . mā mṛdhas kah*. It is clear that this idiom is not always unambiguous; cf. also 3, 3, 8. The non-repetition of a rel. pronoun — e.g. 5, 7, 2 *arhantaś cid yam indhate / [yam] samjanayanti jantavaḥ* is also possible in other languages, e.g. in a somewhat dignified Dutch style of speaking or writing.

A curious type of 'sous-entendu' was, in all probability, rightly assumed by G. in 1, 100, 4 *so aṅgīrobhir aṅgirastamo bhūd / vṛṣā vṛṣabhīḥ sakhībhiḥ sakhā san*: the superlative suffix in *aṅgirastamaḥ* is to be repeated in the next word group (or word groups?): "the [best] bull".

Mention must also be made of the non-repetition of a preverb, e.g. 6, 48, 11 *dhenum ajadhvam upa . . . / sṛjadhvam [upa]*.

In studying the instances of this phenomenon one should take the exigencies of metrum and versification into account, without however exaggerating their influence: 1, 84, 17 *ka iṣate tujyate ko bibhāya* e.g. might represent — as is suggested by G.'s "wer weicht, [wer] flieht, wer hat Furcht" — a sous-entendu, but the assumption of an asyndetic, non-anaphoric *ka iṣate tujyate* — the verbs are of the same length, rhyming, and of similar sense — followed by a somewhat separate *ko bibhāya* is no doubt warranted. A verbal asyndeton though less frequent than a similar succession of nouns is a well-known scheme: 1, 127, 3. One can also ask oneself whether the non-repetition of the verb in 1, 186, 1 and similar cases is not due to metrical factors. Occasionally the Sanskrit word which is

used once must, in a modern language, be translated by two different words: 1, 124, 12 *vasati*- “nest; [couch]”. In 1, 127, 3 G.’s interpretation remains open to discussion: . . . *yamate nāyate* / *dhanvāsahā* [*yato*] *nāyate*; 152, 4 is rather to be regarded as one sentence. Whether passages such as 1, 173, 1 *gāyat sāma* . . . / *arcāma tad vāvṛdhānaṃ svarvat* “he should start the song . . .; let us sing that swelling . . . [song of praise]” may be considered a sous-entendu proper is problematical: the noun is represented by its substitute, the demonstrative and anaphorical *tad*. A demonstrative pronoun may also point to a person who is not indicated otherwise: in 3, 13, 3 *sa yantā vipra eṣāṃ sa* / [*viprāṇām*] is to be assumed. I for one cannot agree with Geldner in translating 2, 11, 15 *trpat somam pāhi drahyad indra* by “trink dich satt, (trink) tüchtig Soma, Indra”; this pāda consists of one sentence in which *drahyad* is a postponed and more or less parenthetical addition to *trpat*. I would consider 5, 53, 2 cd one sentence, d being the subject proper. In 5, 83, 5 c *viśvarūpaḥ* may be the predicate. No non-repetition of a temporal adverb must be assumed in 2, 17, 1 *śuṣmā yad asya pratnathodirate* / *viśvā yad gotrā* . . . *airayat* “in order that his courage rises, as formerly, when . . .”. In 5, 53, 7 G. seems to borrow “[vom Wege]” from the preceding pāda . . . *adhvano vimocane*; the verb *vi vartante* may however be used absolutely. No real sous-entendu should be assumed in cases such as 4, 19, 7 where two objects belonging to the same verb are distributed over two successive pādas, the former including the preverb, the latter the verb proper: *prāgruvo* . . . / *dhvasrā apinvad yuvatīr* . . .; I would in translating insert “and” rather than repeat the verb; similarly, 6, 45, 9. It seems to be a matter of opinion whether in translating 4, 1, 5 *sa tvaṃ no agne avamo bhavotī* / *nediṣṭho* . . . the pronoun “us” should, with G., be repeated, *ned.* may be explicative. The remarkable phrase 5, 53, 10 *gaṇam mārutam navyasīnām* is an instance of enallage rather than a sous-entendu (“der . . . marutische Schar der neuesten [Marut]”, G.). RV. 5, 71, 3 *upa naḥ sutam ā gatam* / . . . *dāśuṣaḥ* (not *dāśuṣām*) may be an ‘anacolouth’.

There exist cases of sous-entendu which are easily avoided in languages which have at their disposal a pronoun of vague sense, replacing a term of the preceding clause or sentence, such as in Dutch *het*, in German *es*. The sentence 1, 44, 10 *asi grāmeṣu avitā purohito* / *asi yajñeṣu mānuṣaḥ* could best be rendered into German as follows: “du (i.e. Agni) bist in den Dörfern der Schirmherr und ‘Vorangestellte’,<sup>210</sup> du bist es bei den Opfern, für die (der) Menschen”. The same thought could be expressed more succinctly: “du b. d. S. u. V. in den D. und bei den O. . . .”. As is well known the tendency to avoid long and complex sentences, for instance complex or double subjects or nominal predicates, is rather strong in the

<sup>209</sup>) Cf. Geldner, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 144.

<sup>210</sup>) For *purohita*- see my relative paper in Festschrift-W. Kirfel, Bonn 1955, p. 107ff. As to *purohito mānuṣaḥ* see 9, 66, 20.

Veda which prefers partial anaphoric repetitions including, for instance, the second component of the subject or predicate group.<sup>211)</sup>

Attention may finally be drawn to a type of anaphora which is, in the Veda, of considerable frequency. In 5, 6, 1 *astam* "home" is twice repeated, but the verb occurs only once: *astam yaṃ yanti dhenavaḥ* / *astam arvanta āśavo* [viz. *yanti*] / *astam nityāso vājinaḥ* [viz. *yanti*]. In parallel clauses preceded by a clause including a combination of preverb and verb form it is an ancient idiomatic custom to repeat the preverb, not the verb: cf. 4, 17, 11 *sam indro gā aṣṣat sam hiraṇyā* and, in Homer, Δ 447 σὺν ᾧ ἔβαλον ῥωούς, σὺν δ' ἔρχεα . . .<sup>212)</sup>.

A syntactic phenomenon of so frequent occurrence as the sous-entendu could not fail to strike those who were interested in the peculiarities and intricacies of their own language. In principle, one of the four alamkāras described in Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra, viz. the dīpaka, is the sous-entendu: 17, 57 (16, 55) "when words agreeing with different (sets of) words are combined into one sentence by way of illuminating them together it is a dīpaka"; the example of this "condensed expression" given in the next stanza running as follows: *sarāṃsi haṃsaiḥ kusumaiś ca vṛkṣā mattair dvirephaiś ca saroruhāṇi* / *goṣṭhībhir udyānavanāni caiva tasminn aśūnyāni sadā kriyante* "there fullness was always effected by swans in the lakes, by flowers in the trees, by intoxicated bees in the lotus flowers, and by companies (of men and women) in the parks and the gardens". Compare, in the R̥gveda 10, 14, 3 *mātali kavayair yamo aṅgirobhir bṛhaspatir ṛkvaḥ* / *vāvṛdhānaḥ*; 17, 13 *yas te drapsa skanno yas te aṃśur avaś* [skannaś] *ca yaḥ paraḥ śrucā* [skannaḥ], and with interruption: 10, 80, 1; 121, 4; cf. also 1, 68, 5.

Some words must be said of the asyndeton. When it reads 1, 10, 2 *yat sānoḥ sānum āruhad* / *bhūry aspasta kartvam* / *tad indro artham cetati* an English or German translator would prefer "when he had . . . ascended the summit and saw . . .": yet, G.'s "(und)" should not create the impression of an omission in the original text.<sup>213)</sup> Some other examples of two asyndetically connected verbal or nominal clauses are: 1, 38, 5; 52, 11; 66, 5 (antithesis); 113, 8 (antithesis); 3, 9, 2; 16, 2; 53, 5; 4, 16, 20; 18, 7. Some types of asyndeton, e.g. the asyndeton bimembre (Umbr. *veiro pequo*, Av. *pasu vira* "men and cattle"), are no doubt ancient or at least 'common Indo-European'. Among these is, probably to a considerable extent, also the absence of any indication, by means of conjunctions, or particles, of a copulative, adversative, causal or consecutive relation between two clauses or sentences: this type of asyndeton, which was no doubt frequent in colloquial speech, occurs, for instance, often in early Latin.<sup>214)</sup>

<sup>211)</sup> See Stylistic repetition in the Veda, passim.

<sup>212)</sup> See Stylistic repetition in the Veda, p. 144.

<sup>213)</sup> Cf. also Stylistic repetition in the Veda, p. 386ff.; Speyer, Ved. und Skt.-Syntax, §§ 102; 258; 259; Delbrück, Altind. Syntax, p. 59; 73; 75.

<sup>214)</sup> (M. Leumann-)J. B. Hofmann, Lat. Grammatik, München 1928, p. 653;

An asyndeton is also apt to occur if a word group included in a separate pāda is to be connected with a co-ordinated word group in the preceding part of the sentence: 1, 15, 6 *yuvam dakṣam dhṛtavrata mītrāvaruṇa dūlabham | ṛtunā yajñam āsāthe*, where the verb *āsāthe* of course belongs also to *dakṣam d.* Cf. 1, 112, 4; 2, 3, 6; 13, 7; 3, 57, 6; 4, 10, 3 etc. The pāda connection in 1, 18, 3 *mā nah śaṃso araruṣo | dhūrtiḥ praṇāṇi martyasya* is comparable. Cf. 1, 93, 3; 6, 22, 9. A group of proper names is not rarely asyndetically added to one or more other names: 2, 31, 4. If the members of a coordinated word group are placed in different pādas no conjunction is indeed needed: 1, 22, 9 *agne patnīr ihā vaha . . . | tvaṣṭāraṃ somapītaye*; 22, 15; 80, 15; 103, 8; 3, 49, 1; 52, 6. The same remark applies to two word groups which constitute a pāda: 1, 58, 3; 83, 6 and to the scheme 3, 32, 3 *ye te śuśmaṃ ye taviṣim avarḍhan* "who increased your strength, your courage" where the modern expression would be: "y. s. and (y.) c.", and, as is well known, to two words: 1, 95, 8; 118, 7; 131, 7; 168, 7; 180, 7; 2, 13, 6; 16, 1 (antithesis); 3, 6, 3; 7, 5; 10, 6; 54, 7; 5, 41, 8 etc., also if they do not follow each other immediately 4, 17, 10. This syntactic peculiarity may entail loose and free sentence structures, e.g. 1, 58, 3; 74, 4.

Among the other remarkable schemata which are at least from the point of view of a modern translator characterized by brevity are the following, in which a conjunction seems to be missing. ṚV. 4, 1, 14 *vidanta jyotiḥ cakṛpanta dhībhiḥ* "sie fanden das Licht, (nachdem) sie in ihren Gedanken darnach verlangt hatten" (G.), literally, however: "they have found (aor.) the light: they were in the condition of longing for (it) by their inspirations"; 5, 59, 1 *ukṣante aśvān taruṣanta ā rajaḥ* "they sprinkle their horses, (when) they pass through space". Now cases of what in German is called 'Satzasyndeton' present themselves also in other ancient literatures. We sometimes find successive pairs of sentences, the first of the pair expressing circumstances, the second the result; the first may also introduce a ground, example of, or proposition.<sup>215)</sup> "Wie die Umgangssprache der Hypotaxe aus dem Wege geht, so liebt sie auch bei der Beiordnung der Sätze die lockere partikellose Anreihung, indem sie es der Betonung, dem Zusammenhang, der Situation überlässt, die logischen Beziehungen zwischen den einzelnen Sätzen zu knüpfen".<sup>216)</sup> A colloquial style of speaking appears also 5, 75, 2 *aty āyātam . . . ahaṃ sanā* "kommet . . . vorbei, (auf das) ich gewinne" (G.). Sometimes we are inclined to insert "then, so", Germ. "dann": 4, 21, 8 *vi yad . . . vṛṇve . . . / vidad . . .* (inversion in the principal clause ('Nachsatz')); 6, 22, 9 *dhiṣva vajraṃ dakṣiṇe . . . / viśvā . . . dayase vi māyāḥ*.

Occasionally a conjunction is sous-entendu: 1, 164, 23; 4, 5, 12.

Hofmann, Lat. Umgangssprache, Heidelberg 1936, p. 110f. Cf. also H. Reichelt, Awestisches Elementarbuch, Heidelberg 1909, p. 356.

<sup>215)</sup> Cf. e.g. J. D. Denniston, Greek prose style, Oxford 1952, p. 118 ff.

<sup>216)</sup> J. B. Hofmann, Lateinische Umgangssprache<sup>2</sup>, Heidelberg 1936, p. 110.



According to the common definition the aposiopesis consists in suddenly breaking off speaking in the middle of a sentence. The reason for doing so may be that the speaker hesitates which word to employ, dares not continue, is too much excited to formulate his thoughts, notices that the hearer has already caught the meaning, or yields to the natural disinclination to use more circumstantial expressions than are necessary to convey one's meaning.<sup>217</sup>) "Von der affektischen Ellipse unterscheidet sich die Aposiopese lediglich durch bewussten Selbstabbruch der Rede mit Schlusspause, die durch Gesten und Gebärden das Fehlende — Sätze und Satz-teile — ersetzen lässt".<sup>218</sup>)

One can hardly escape the conviction that in the Vedic mantras a considerable part of incomplete clauses or sentences are due to the inclination on the part of the poet to make a syntactic unit and a metrical unit coincide. Thus in 1, 15, 1 ff. a group of gods is individually invited to drink soma and the imperative *piba*, or *pibata*, is several times repeated. In st. 7 however, it is missing, but the sudden interruption does not prevent the audience — whether the god or the human hearers — from understanding what is meant by the poet: *draviṇodā draviṇaso | grāvahastāso adhvare | yañṇeṣu devam ilate*. This is an aposiopesis rather than an ellipsis or anacoluthon (Geldner): "the (god) who grants wealth (be invited to drink); having the pressing stones in their hands they request the god...". Obvious instances of aposiopesis occur after the 'prohibitive' *mā* which is to express rejection of the realization of a process<sup>219</sup>): 1, 54, 1 *mā no asmin maghavan pṛtsu amhasi : mā prakṣaipṣir iti śeṣaḥ* (S.) "do not let us down in these contests, in this distress"; 173, 12 (*maiva tyāksir iti śeṣaḥ*, S.). In an invitation to come Indra is, 1, 129, 10, requested to make use of any chariot, but the text is obviously formulated as succinctly as possible: *ratham kaṃ cid amartya*, viz. *vegavantam āruhya asmaddevayajanam śighram āgaccheti śeṣaḥ* (S.). Cf. also 1, 174, 3; 5, 74, 4 and 5, 46, 2; 7, 36, 6; 88, 6.

Occasionally a whole clause is to be tacitly supplemented: 1, 8, 6 *samohe vā ya āsata naras . . .* "whatever men have gained in war . . . (viz. that is through Indra's greatness)": cf. st. 5 *mahām indraḥ*<sup>220</sup>); 8, 40, 8; 47, 4<sup>221</sup>); 5, 74, 10 a principal clause introducing direct speech is left unexpressed; 7, 91, 4. Other incomplete sentences are 1, 9, 9 (aposiopesis rather than ellipsis<sup>222</sup>)); 14, 3 consisting exclusively of names of gods in the accusative; they are of course to be praised or invited; 2, 11, 4; 43, 3. ṚV. 6, 18, 8 was regarded as a sous-entendu by Sāyaṇa, who construed *camurim dhunim*

<sup>217</sup>) See e.g. O. Jespersen, The philosophy of grammar, London (1935), p. 142.

<sup>218</sup>) J. B. Hofmann, Lateinische Umgangssprache, Heidelberg 1936, p. 53.

<sup>219</sup>) See J. Gonda, The character of the Indo-European moods, Wiesbaden 1956, p. 101f.

<sup>220</sup>) Otherwise but unconvincingly Oldenberg, Ṛgveda. Noten, I, p. 11f.

<sup>221</sup>) See Geldner, o.c., II, p. 367.

<sup>222</sup>) "Elliptischer Satz", Geldner, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 10.

*ca avṛṇak*, as an ellipsis or zeugma by Geldner; in my opinion it is an aposiopesis: *sa . . . camuriṃ dhuniṃ ca / vṛṇak pipruṃ . . .* RV. 1, 117, 17 may be an anacoluthon rather than an aposiopesis. Other instances of anacoluthon are: 7, 47, 4; 1, 30, 1; 8, 31, 14; 7, 64, 1 is a nominativus pendens <sup>223</sup>); cf. 8, 23, 9. RV. 8, 23, 11 no example of anacoluthon, *indhānā sah* being the subject, *bṛhad bhāh* apposition.

Now that we have described the main types of brevity in speech and have surveyed the different parts of speech phrases and structures affected by the tendency to syntactic brevity as far as they occur in this ancient collection of texts, it is time to turn to some complications and combinations. The very fact that cases of double ellipsis and other omission affecting the structure of the same clause or syntactic group are not rare shows the extent to which these phenomena had spread in the language of Vedic poetry. As there are different sub-types it seems worth while to consider a large number of examples more closely.

Sometimes two of the above types of brevity occur conjointly.<sup>224</sup> For instance, the subject or a term determining it and the verb of the same sentence may from the point of view of a logical sentence construction be wanting: 1, 122, 5 *pra vaḥ pūṣṇe dāvana ā* “(sc. start) your (sc. song) in honour of P. that he may give”; thus G., but the question arises whether these words do not simply mean: “along, on your behalf, with a view to P., that . . .”; 1, 37, 10 *ud u tye sūnavo giraḥ* (“wohl doppelt elliptisch”, G.) <sup>225</sup> “these sons (sc. of Rudra start) their songs of praise”; as in a poem addressed to the Maruts it is clear whose sons are meant, and as the preverb often occurs alone, the construction of the sentence is not so obscure as it would appear to be at first sight. See also 5, 54, 2 likewise addressed to the Maruts: *pra vo marutas taviṣā udanyavo / vayovṛdho āsvayujah pariḥrayah*.

Yet not all instances are in the original Sanskrit so harsh and disjointed as is suggested by the translations: 3, 51, 10 *idaṃ hy anv ojasā sutam . . .* “diese (Trankspende), die mit Kraft ausgepreszt ist, (steht) ja bereit” (G.). The last pāda of 3, 54, 5 *yā* refers to *pathyā* in b and the verb is sous-entendu (*eti*). In 5, 5, 4 (*āprīsūkta*) the context and position of the stanza show that it is addressed to the barhis and *sātaye (bhava)* is a ‘final dative’; in translating no additions are needed.

Even when there is no certainty about the exact term to supply, the general tenor of a line or stanza may be sufficiently clear: cf. e.g. 4, 17, 11 *maghavā yo ha pūrvīḥ* — (: *bahvīḥ śatrusenāḥ samajayat*, S., *purah?* G.).

Similar observations may be made in connection with other ‘shortenings’: cf. e.g. 4, 19, 5; 29, 3; 5, 10, 6; 30, 7 (no addition needed); 39, 3 (aposiopesis), 45, 3 (sous-entendu).

<sup>223</sup>) See Havers, Handbuch, p. 84.

<sup>224</sup>) For radical shortenings of formulas of address see J. Svennung, Anredefor-men, Uppsala 1958, p. 424ff.

<sup>225</sup>) The alternative: zeugma of *atnata* (pāda 2) is less probable, because of *ud*, the verb *ut-tan-* being semantically too different.

Geldner has, in his translation, sometimes bracketed two terms where I would hesitate to assume even a single case of ellipsis. In 1, 90, 7 a, e.g., *madhu naktam utošāsaḥ* the absence of “be for us” is very inconspicuous (cf. 7 c *madhu dyaur astu naḥ pitā*); cf. also 1, 100, 5. So the number of complications is less than G. would have us believe. In 1, 142, 11 *avasṛjann upa tmanā | devān yakṣi* . . . the acc. *devān* goes with *avasṛjann upa* — which is used absolutely — as well as *yakṣi*.

It would be vain to attempt to classify all combinations accurately. Some special complications may, however, be distinguished. In 1, 122, 8 *jano yaḥ pajrebhyo vājinivān | aśvāvato rathino mahyaṃ sūriḥ* a sous-entendu (*vājān aśv. r.*) and a case of brachylogy (“gave”) seem to occur conjointly: or is it really one single brachylogy, the adjectival *vājinivān* being ‘mentally repeated’ and governing, while supplying the nominal idea, the accusatives: <sup>226</sup>) that is to say, is it a kind of free zeugma? The pāda 1, 162, 3 c represents a ‘complicated sous-entendu’, not a case of ellipsis (G.): both elements missing may be supplied from what precedes, but the construction in itself is ‘ungrammatical’ and the clause incomplete: *abhipriyaṃ yat puroḷāṣam arvatā*.

The object and another element are left out in 1, 88, 6 *astobhayad vṛthāsām | anu svadhām gabhastyoḥ* “er liesz nach Lust (sc. den Ton, *stubham* or *ślokaṃ*) dieser (sc. Lieder, *girām* G., *ṛcām*, cf. S.), nach eigenem Belieben den der Hände erschallen” (G.); 5, 87, 4 the object and the verb are wanting, but two adjectives belonging to the former are included; 6, 2, 9 *tvam tyā cid acyutāgne* “du (friszt) selbst die festen (Hölzer), o Agni” (G.). In 6, 18, 10 the object and another substantive are left unexpressed: *gambhīraya ṛṣvayā yo ruroja*; S. supplies *hetyā* and *śatrūn*, G. “Stimme” and *rakṣaḥ* or *purah*; the allusion is indeed not very clear. In 6, 22, 6 S. may be right in adding *vṛtram vi rujah*: *ayā ha tyam māyayā vāvṛdhānam | manojuvā svatavaḥ parvatena*. A substantive and the pronoun referring to the poet and his principal are wanting e.g. 6, 25, 2.

But even those who are inclined to blame the R̥gvedic style for its frequent shortenings and obscurities will have to admit that, for instance, 1, 42, 1 *praty asmaḥ pipīṣate | viśvāni viduṣe bhara*, although two elements are from the point of view of logical syntax missing, constitutes a well-constructed, well-balanced, perfectly natural and in its context intelligible line: “to him, who thirsts (for it), who knows all (or: all things) offer (soma)”. Cf. e.g. also 1, 180, 4 d *rathyeva cakrā prati yanti madhvaḥ* explained as “die (Gaben) des süszen (Trunks) gehen (jetzt) zurück wie die Wagenräder” (G.): <sup>227</sup>) one may imagine that the poet after having fashioned — probably with the help of his memory — this pāda left it at that, because his audience would understand it at half a word.

The absence of the participle *sant-* and a simultaneous sous-entendu

<sup>226</sup>) Renou, Gramm. védique, p. 344.

<sup>227</sup>) An improbable explication: Oldenberg, R̥gveda Noten, I, p. 179.

result in a structure of at first sight surprising brevity: 6, 39, 2 *ayam usānaḥ pary adrim usrāḥ*. As is well known the participle of *es-* "to be" could also in other I.-E. languages be omitted where we would expect it: a 301 *μάλα γάρ σ' ὄρωσ' καλόν τε μέγαν τε*; Latin even does without it.

Three elements of the sentence are from the point of view of logical syntax missing in cases such as 1, 30, 2 (addressed to Indra) *śataṃ vā yaḥ śucīnām . . . samāsīram* "der hundert (Spenden) des reinen . . . des milch-gemischten (Soma trinkt)" (G.). There is however no denying that in this context and situation this 'mutilated' sentence has remained intelligible. The accented verb of 3, 1, 1 points to the subordinate character of the first clause which constitutes pāda a, the verb for "offering" is sous-entendu: *somasya mā tavasaṃ vaksy agne | vahniṃ cakārtha vidathe yajadhyaī*. The well-known opposition *āmā* "uncooked" (for the cow) and *pakvam* "boiled, prepared on a fire" (for the milk)<sup>228</sup> helps us in understanding 4, 3, 9 a. Cf. also 1, 71, 3; 174, 3; 180, 4; 5, 29, 1; 6, 6, 3.

Sometimes two successive 'incomplete' pādas explain each other: 1, 141, 2 *prkṣo vapuḥ | pītumān nitya ā śaye | dvitīyam ā saptaśivāsu mātṛṣu*; in a *mātṛṣu* or *mātṛḥ* is sous-entendu, in b *ā śaye*; the subject, Agni, is self-evident; the adjective *nitya-* occurs in a similar context, without a substantive 1, 140, 7; cf. also 7, 1, 2 etc.

This is however not to deny that occasionally a stanza abounds in brevity to such an extent that comprehension and interpretation are seriously hampered: see e.g. 1, 59, 4;<sup>229</sup> 4, 8, 8; 6, 1, 8; 29, 5 (cf. 37, 5). Nor should we deny these poets a preference for meaning repetition of the same word in more than one sense, for allusions and ambiguity which would have been 'spoiled' by the insertion of other words. The line 4, 7, 11 *trṣu yad annā trṣuṇā vavakṣa | trṣuṇ dūtāṃ kṛṇute yahvo agniḥ* might have delighted the initiated and the connoisseurs, notwithstanding the almost enigmatical wording.

Occasionally we are under the impression that the poet has incorporated a proverb or saying. A much discussed passage is 3, 1, 11 *urau mahām anibādhe vavardhā | āpo agniṃ yaśasaḥ saṃ hi pūrvīḥ*.<sup>230</sup> Whatever the exact meaning of this line the last four words recur 10, 46, 10. That they express the truth that many females rally round a man of high reputation seems clear, that the poet had difficulty in fashioning a syntactically rounded pāda probable.

Sometimes the syntactic structure of a stanza induces us to suppose the poet to have utilized a pāda or word group which belonged to his stock of 'poetical phrases' without succeeding in combining it with the other elements of the stanza so as to form a harmonious whole. Thus the last pāda of 1, 30, 17 where it does not suit the preceding words very

<sup>228</sup>) See e.g. Grassmann, Wörterbuch, 181; 757.

<sup>229</sup>) Cf. Oldenberg, R̥gveda. Noten, I, p. 58ff.

<sup>230</sup>) See e.g. Geldner, Ved. Stud. I, p. 166; Oldenberg, R̥gveda Noten I, p. 225.

well — *āśvināv aśvāvatyēṣā yatam savīrayā | gomad dasrā hiraṇyavat* recurs 1, 92, 16 b and 8, 22, 17 c in a syntactically flawless construction. Cf. also 2, 35, 14 . . . *svayam atkaiḥ* . . . : 4, 18, 5 *svayam atkaṃ vasānaḥ*; 10, 131, 3 II: 4, 17, 16 I.<sup>231</sup>) The words 3, 6, 9 *devān | anuṣvadhā ā vaha* . . . recur without *devān*, for which there was no room,<sup>232</sup>) in 2, 3, 11.

There are indeed in the Ṛgveda logically incomplete and at the same time syntactically clumsily constructed sentences, which however are composed of pādas that are as to syntax and style flawless. ṚV. 1, 103, 4 (“ein eigentümlich verschlungener Satz”) may be quoted as an example in point: *tad ūcuṣe mānuṣemā yugāni | kīrtenyam maghavā nāma bibhrat | upaprayan dasyuhatyāya vajrī | yad dha sūnuḥ śravase nāma dadhe* “ihm, der das gewohnt ist, (gaben) diese menschlichen Geschlechter (jenen Namen), der den . . . Namen m. trägt und den N. s. ś., den . . . er sich erworben hat” (G.).<sup>233</sup>) The most plausible view of this construction probably is that the poet has not succeeded in fashioning a stanza which could fulfil the requirements of standard syntax as this was in the course of time to develop. We cannot even be sure if the poet ever made a serious attempt to construct such a stanza. Cf. also 1, 106, 4 *narāśamsam vājinaṃ vājayan iha | kṣayadvīram pūṣanam sumnair īmahe : vājayan* “elliptisch oder Anakoluthie oder für *vājyantah*” (G.); 141, 11 *asme rayim na svarthaṃ damūnasam* (an imperative: “give” is wanting) | *bhagaṃ dakṣam na papr̥cāsi dharmasim | raśmīmr iva yo* (i.e. the *damūnaḥ*) *yamati janmanī ubhe | devānām śamsam* (i.e. *yo yamati*) *ṛta ā ca sukratuḥ*; 3, 1, 9 II *guhā carantaṃ sakhibhiḥ śivebhir | divo yāvibhir na guhā babhūva* (anacoluthon or aposiopesis); 1, 120, 5 *pra yā ghoṣe bhṛgavāne na śobhe | yayā vācā yajati pajr̥iyo vām | praiṣayur na vidvān*. Compare also 3, 6, 8 *īmā vā ye suhāvāso yajatrā |* (or whose) *āyemire rathyo agne aśvāḥ*; 4, 7, 9; 5, 3, 9 I *ava spr̥dhi pitaraṃ yodhi (śatrūn) vidvān (tasya) | putro yas . . .*; 5, 35, 2; 44, 1; 7, 36, 6; 8, 2, 2-3; 8, 102, 7; 10, 10, 1; 125, 4.

Hence also the occurrence of a number of parentheses and ‘anacolutha’ which have not failed to arrest the attention of my predecessors: 8, 6, 22; 9, 61, 22 *sa pavaṣva ya āvithendram vr̥trāya hantave | vavrvāmsam mahīr apah* (vav. belongs to *vr̥trāya!*); 6, 48, 1; 8, 1, 8; 9, 107, 1; 10, 103, 9. ṚV. 7, 64, 1 may however be considered an instance of a nominativus absolutus (pendens) *divi kṣayantā rajasah p̥rthivyām | pra vām . . . dadīran*. In 1, 91, 6 a vocative is followed by a nominative; *vam ca soma . . . | priyastoto vanaspatiḥ*; cf., in Latin, Plaut. Asin. 691 *mi Libane, ocellus aureus* and constructions such as, in Greek, α 50 f. *νήσω ἐν ἀμφιπόρῃ . . . | νῆσος δένδρῆσσα*.<sup>234</sup>)

<sup>231</sup>) See Geldner, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 439 and III, p. 363.

<sup>232</sup>) M. Bloomfield, Rig-veda repetitions, Harvard 1916, p. 164. See also the same, p. 341 (8, 49, 6: 8, 5, 7); p. 377 (8, 92, 26: 8, 45, 10), p. 415 (9, 16, 8), etc.

<sup>233</sup>) See also Oldenberg, Ṛgveda. Noten, I, p. 98.

<sup>234</sup>) See the present author’s article on nominatives joining or ‘replacing’ vocatives, Lingua 6 (1956), p. 89ff.

It is indeed far from certain whether Geldner and other translators are always right in suggesting, by the insertion of words for which there are no equivalents in the original text, smooth sentences and perfect constructions. It is an a priori improbable assumption that the language in which the Vedic poets expressed themselves should be in perfect harmony with the rules of syntax and with the requirements of a lucid, unambiguous, well-balanced, and logically flawless style.<sup>235</sup> In Indian as well as in other civilizations it took centuries of preparation to reach this high standard. Is it indeed necessary to insert e.g. in 2, 19, 2 a verb *ahim indro . . . vi vṛscat* / *pra yad . . .* / *prayāmsi ca nadīnāṃ cakramanta* "zerhieb I. den . . . Drachen und (machte), dasz die Labsale der Flüsse (dem Meere) zueilten . . ." (G.)? In 3, 51, 8 *pāhi somam . . .* / *jātaṃ yat tvā pari devā abhūṣan* G. inserts "trink . . . (wie damals) als . . ."; does not the preterite suffice to indicate that the latter process belongs to the past? Cf. also 4, 2, 16 *yathā naḥ pītarāḥ . . .* / *śucīd ayan . . . ukthasāsah* "und wie unsere . . . Ahnen . . ., (so) mögen (jetzt) die . . . kommen" (G.). As the dative indicates the aim of a process the construction of 4, 2, 18 is intelligible . . . *akṛpran* / *vṛdhe cid aryah* "haben Sehnsucht . . . bekommen; (sie sind) sogar (bereit) . . . zu fördern" (G.), rather "longed for us (felt sympathy . . . just to further (to further indeed) . . .".

In another section of this treatise the question is raised whether the pāda 1, 122, 5 *pra vaḥ pūṣṇe dāvana ā*, translated by G. "(stimmet) auf P. euer (Lied) an, dasz er schenke!", actually represents a case of double ellipsis. Could it not literally mean "along, on your behalf, with a view to P., with regard to giving"? If so this sentence must be regarded as a fine specimen of rudimentary syntax, occurring in a succession of invocations of varied structure. There are more places where a request, prayer or injunction is formulated in a loosely constructed utterance containing some indispensable elements, which may be accompanied by one or more particles: 5, 17, 5 *nū na id dhi vāryam* "so uns nun wünschenswertes!" rather than "s. (bring) u. n. w. (Gut)" (G.); 3, 15, 5; 19, 3; 7, 25, 1 *ā te maha indroty ugra*. Statements and addresses may likewise be worded in this 'rudimentary' way: 5, 6, 6 *pro tye agnaye agniṣu* "diese Feuer (haben) unter (allen) Feuern den Vorrang"; 2, 34, 10. Cf. also 2, 3, 6; 40, 4 II; 3, 19, 3; 5, 15, 5; 6, 15, 14; 7, 66, 5. Especially in the vivid language of daily life, in the brisk and emotional conversation of the ordinary man, long and exact formulations, well-constructed periods and complete sentences often are a superfluity, or rather they are not wished for, the speakers do not require them. It is here that various features of what may be called rudimentary syntax are apt to appear. Dramatists and other authors who try to imitate the conversational style often make therefore their characters speak as follows: Ter. Eun. 317 ff. *quid tua istaec?*

<sup>235</sup>) For Vedic prose see also the remarks made by Speyer, *Ved. u. Skt. Syntax*, § 287.



:: *nova figura oris*. :: *papae*. :: *color verus, corpus solidum et suci plenum*. :: *anni?* :: *anni? sedecim*. :: *flos ipsus*; Flaubert, *Bov.* 2, 6 *mais le devoir avant tout, vous savez*.

The well-known idiom, preverb alone instead of preverb and verb has already been commented upon by Renou.<sup>236</sup> Some examples are: (hortative) 3, 18, 4 *uc chociṣā sahasas putra stutaḥ* "(flame) up, O son of conquering power, with (thy) light, being praised"; 1, 14, 6 *ā devān somapītaye*; 7, 2 *ā*; 3, 4, 8 *ā*; 58, 2 *vi*; (expressing an intention) 1, 78, 1 *abhi tvā gotamā girā* lit. "unto thee, (we Gotamas) with (our) word of praise"; (invitation) 3, 61, 5 *achā* . . .; 4, 21, 6 *ā*; (in a statement) 1, 30, 3 *saṃ yan madāya* . . .; 62, 8 *pari*; 84, 10-12 *anu*; 86, 5 *viśvā yaś carṣaṇir abhi*; 120, 5 *pra*; 151, 1 *prati*; 2, 13, 11 *pra*; 10, 61, 26 (*ā*). The iterative *pra-pra* 1, 129, 8. A participle is wanting: 1, 64, 9 *ā*; 2, 35, 2; 10, 29, 7 *abhi*. After a verb + preverb: 1, 132, 4 *avṛṇor apa . . . apa*. The preverb may occupy various positions: 1, 181, 5 *mathrā rajāṃsy aśvinā vi ghoṣaiḥ*; 2, 16, 7 *pra te nāvam* . . .; 3, 27, 1 *pra* . . .; 47, 3 . . . *maruto ye tvānu* |. It may be repeated: 10, 15, 1 *ud vṛatām avara ut parāsa* | *un madhyamāḥ pitarah somyāsaḥ*; 7, 61, 3. It may be repeated so as to be followed by preverb + verb: 5, 54, 4 *vi aktūn rudrā vy ahāni . . . vi . . . vi . . .* | *vi yad ajrām ajatha*. It may therefore alternate with a 'complete' construction: 6, 10, 5 *ye rādhasā . . . aty anyām* | *svīryebhiś cābhi santi janān*.

Very often it is anaphorically repeated<sup>237</sup> in parallel clauses preceded by a clause including the preverb as well as the verb which is omitted in the succeeding clauses.<sup>238</sup> These lines are characteristic of the style of Vedic poetry in general<sup>239</sup>: 4, 17, 11 *saṃ indro gā ajayat saṃ hiraṇyā* | *saṃ aśviyā* . . . This idiom is no doubt ancient; it recurs in Greek, e.g. Hdt. 3, 126 *κατὰ μὲν ἔκτεινε Μ. . . , κατὰ δὲ τοῦ Μ. τὸν παῖδα*; Homer, *Δ* 447 *σὺν ῥ' ἔβαλον ῥινούς, σὺν δ' ἔγχεα καὶ μένε' ἀνδρῶν* — compare also the type *E* 603 *τῶ δ' αἰεὶ πάρα εἰς γε θεῶν*<sup>240</sup> — and in the language of the Avesta.<sup>241</sup>

This use of preverbs is in my opinion not integrally, and at least not in essence and origin to be regarded as a type of ellipsis, but rather as a form of brevity of speech which verging on 'primitive' or 'rudimentary' syntax was apt to occur in colloquial usage, especially in animated discussions and brisk conversations springing from a lively imagination. The

<sup>236</sup>) Renou, *Ét. véd. et pāṇ.*, I, p. 30ff., to which the reader may be referred.

<sup>237</sup>) In 9, 23, 4 (quoted by Renou, o.c., p. 31) the second *abhi* functions as a 'preposition' not as a 'preverb'.

<sup>238</sup>) See Stylistic repetition in the Veda, p. 144ff., where a variety of examples are discussed.

<sup>239</sup>) For the stylistic value of anaphora and ellipsis see also the interesting observations made by S. Gili y Gaya, *Curso superior de sintaxis española*<sup>5</sup>, Barcelona 1955, p. 301.

<sup>240</sup>) For this use of preverbs in nominal clauses see P. Chantraine, *Gramm. homérique II*, Paris 1953, p. 3; cf. also Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, I, p. 652.

<sup>241</sup>) I refer to Reichelt, *Awestisches Elementarbuch*, p. 266ff.

occurrence of an accusative in verbless sentences including a 'preverb' may not be adduced as an argument in favour of the thesis that these sentences are, all and sundry, elliptical. The accusative being the case which generally speaking indicates in a vague and unspecified way a relation between the word put in that case and another element of the sentence, whether a verb or another word<sup>242</sup>), may also 'depend on' the situation: that is to say: the occurrence of an accusative in a verbless sentence may be explained, not only from an omitted or implicit verbal idea, but also from the combination of circumstances existing at the moment of speaking. The accusativus exclamatoris in Latin and elsewhere may be quoted as a case in point: *heu (o) me miserum!*; Cic. Verr. 5, 92 *o istius nequitiam singularem*; Plaut. Aul. 712 *attat eccum ipsum* "aha! there he comes!"; similarly, in Sanskrit, Mbh. 1, 131, 23 *dhig etām vaḥ kṛtāstratām* "shame over your skill at arms!"; in O.H. German and M.H.G. the interjections *wola* and *pfui* likewise assumed the accusative<sup>243</sup>), cf. also the Engl. *oh me*; *miserable me*. As one of the main functions of those ancient adverbs which could also act as preverbs or prepositions was to express the idea of movement or direction they could in the particular contexts and situations in which they were used be followed by a substantive in the accusative. This case form indicated that there was a relation between the context-bound idea of movement and the nominal concept. The popular brevity which is characteristic of these constructions is also proper to the otherwise unrelated expressions such as in Dutch *weg die hond* and the English equivalent *away with that dog*; *hier die jongen* etc.

Speaking more generally the use of a preverb 'instead of a verb + preverb' has much in common with, and should in principle not be disconnected from, such structures as, e.g. in Dutch, *hij gauw er achter aan*; *hoed af!*; *hier met dat mes!*; *vort (met) dat paard!*; *naar de vuilnisbak met die rommel!*; *op naar Den Haag*; or in German: *sie auf, und streckt den Fuss von sich*; *und hinein . . . in die Zellen der Schwestern*; *er rasch vom Pferd*. "So wird in volkstümlicher Rede ein Bericht über eine Bewegung oft ohne Verbum gegeben, z.B. *ich rasch hinterdrein . . .* Am leichtesten können Aufforderungs- und Wunschsätze ein Verbum entbehren. Ganz gewöhnlich sind solche mit Richtungsbezeichnungen, einem Adverbium oder einer präpositionellen Verbindung, vgl. *Bier her, Gewehr über, Schwamm drüber*; (Schiller) *vorüber die stöhnende Klage*".<sup>244</sup>) Verbless structures of this character have in Vedic joined other clauses so as to form a syntactic unity: 1, 14, 6 . . . *manoyujo* / . . . *vahnayeh* / *ā devān somapitaye* lit. "the draught animals yoked by thought here the gods (object) in order to

<sup>242</sup>) For the accusative see The character of the Sanskrit accusative, in Miscelánea homenaje-A. Martinet, I, La Laguna Can., 1947, p. 47ff.; The functions of the accusative, S. K. Belvalkar Felicitation Volume, Banaras 1957, p. 72ff.

<sup>243</sup>) See e.g. O. Erdmann-O. Mensing, Grundzüge der deutschen Syntax, II, Stuttgart 1895, p. 120f.; O. Behaghel, Deutsche Syntax, I, Heidelberg 1923, p. 726f.

<sup>244</sup>) Paul, Deutsche Grammatik IV, p. 372f.

drink soma!". There can be hardly any doubt that these constructions are founded on vivid and situation-bound speech habits of the general public.

Occasionally a preverb occurring in a preceding clause is not repeated <sup>245</sup>): 1, 37, 7 *ni vo yāmāya mānuṣo / dadhra ugrāya manyave / jihīta parvato girih*, cf. 8, 7, 2 *ni parvatā ahāsata* and 34 *girayaś cin ni jihate*: "... es duckt sich der Fels ..." (G.); 2, 35, 12 *saṃ sānu mārjmi didhiṣāmi bilmair / dadhāmy annaiḥ pari vanda ṛgbhiḥ* the preverb may even 'belong' to two other verbs. Cf. also 8, 20, 4 *vi dvīpāni pāpatan tiṣṭhad duchūnā*; 10, 68, 2 etc. This sous-entendu is not foreign to other ancient I.-E. languages: cf. in Greek, Plato, Phaed. 59 b οὐτός τε δὴ δ' Ἀπολλόδωρος . . . παρῆν . . . ἦν δὲ καὶ Κτήσιππος; Eur. Or. 1101 f. etc.<sup>246</sup>). This feature is neither an ellipsis nor a brachylogy; it is a natural result of the original autonomy of the preverb.

Even if only one element of the sentence, for instance the verb, is wanting, a stanza may impress us as a specimen of sketchy or unlaboured narrative style: in 2, 24, 7 *te bākubhyāṃ dhamitam agnim aśmani / nakiḥ ṣo asty araṇo jahur hi tam* "they (found) the fire (which was) kindled by (their) arms on the rock, "that is not strange" for they had left it". See also 10, 46, 10 d; 172, 1. Elsewhere the diction is brief, but nothing is wanting: in 1, 117, 4 for instance *aśvaṃ na gūlham aśvinā durevair / ṛṣim narā vṛṣaṇā rebham apsu / saṃ tam riṇītho viprutam daṃsobhiḥ* the poet begins, not with the name of the person whose adventures are recalled to memory, but with the well-known adventure of his imprisonment; his name and a particular of secondary importance (*apsu*) are by way of amplification added, the object (*rebhan*) is repeated by the 'superfluous' pronoun *tam*, and after rereading the stanza we arrive at the conclusion that Geldner's bracketed verb "der . . . im Wasser (lag)" would not have us believe that the stanza is 'elliptic'.

There are on the other hand places where it is difficult to decide whether the poet has not been able — or not even attempted — to mould his style upon the 'rules of syntax' or whether he has intentionally endeavoured to compose a specimen of artificial brevity: if we may follow Geldner in the interpretation of 2, 34, 10 II this half-stanza is a model of a well-balanced, but obscure, allusive eulogy: *yad vā nide navamānasya rudriyās / tritam jarāya juratām adābhyāḥ* "or whether ye, trusty R., (assist) T. with a view to (i.e. in order to remove) the contempt offered to the eulogist, the old age of those who are growing old".

It is only natural that in a volume that gives so much evidence of its authors' predilection for brevity in speech, sous-entendu, brachylogy,

<sup>245</sup>) See Geldner, o.c., I, p. 322 and II, p. 100; cf. also the same on 1, 165, 14 (I<sup>2</sup>, p. 240).

<sup>246</sup>) For more examples see R. Kühner-B. Gerth, *Ausf. Gramm. der griech. Sprache, Satzlehre*, II<sup>4</sup>, Leverkusen 1955, p. 568; Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., p. 422.

ellipsis etc., there are many passages where later generations feel at a loss to decide what was the intention of the poet. Thus 1, 51, 10 *pūryamāṇam* (*balena*, S.) or “mit Soma” (G.); 59, 4; 54, 8; 55, 4; 56, 1; 57; 70, 11; 72, 1; 79, 3 (*varṭate*, S. “kommt”, G.); 103, 1; 122, 15; 153, 4; 165, 9; 12; 166, 11 *divyāḥ* (*divi bhavā devāḥ*, S., “Räume”, Ludwig); 167, 2; 3; 171, 6; 181, 7; 2, 15, 3; 17, 3; 20, 5 (*pūrvyāṇi*, sc. *purāṇi balāni vā*, S.); *pūrvakālaprādurbhūtāni śarīrāṇi*, Mādhava); 3, 1, 7; 7, 3; 5; 3, 11, 8 *sudhitā*, i.e. *vasūni* (S.): *manmāni* (G.); 35, 1; 57, 4 (“das Subjekt muss wiederum erraten werden”, G.); 4, 1, 7; 14; 5, 2, 9 *viśvāni*, i.e. *sarvāni padārthajātāni* (S.): “alle (seine Kräfte)” (G.); 6, 23, 9; 32, 4; 7, 104, 10 etc. The omission or presumed omission of one or more elements sometimes renders a stanza obscure, especially when other difficulties or ambiguous allusions add to the unintelligibility. See e.g. 1, 51, 11; 120, 5; 122, 5<sup>247</sup>); 141, 11<sup>248</sup>); 147, 3. Sāyaṇa was therefore not averse to the assumption of incompleteness, e.g. 1, 70, 4 *adrau cid asmā antar : parvate ’pi madhye haviḥ prayacchantīti śeṣaḥ*; 165, 3 *śubhānaiḥ : śobhamānair vacanaiḥ* (incorrectly); 187, 5; 2, 23, 14; 28, 1 (*idam*, sc. *haviḥ stotraṃ vā*); 3, 4, 5; 14, 7; 7, 36, 4. Sometimes his relevant remarks are explanatory rather than suggestive of an ellipsis: 1, 179, 4; 2, 1, 6.

<sup>247</sup>) Cf. also Oldenberg, Die Hymnen des Rigveda, I, Metr. u. Textgesch. Prolegomena, Berlin 1888, p. 118.

<sup>248</sup>) Cf. Geldner, o.c., I<sup>2</sup>, p. 199.

## SUBJECT INDEX

- absence of a word for "all, every, all other", 31.
- absence of a word for "(the) other(s)", 29.
- absolute constructions, 40.
- absolute use of participles, 41.
- absolute use of verb, 39.
- absorption of a nominal idea by a numeral, 27.
- acceptations, more specialized, 10 f.
- accusative, 78.
- accusative accompanying a verb, 5.
- accusativus exclamationis, 78.
- adjective, 41.
- adjective acting as a substantive, 18.
- adjective 'equivalent to a subordinate clause', 50.
- adjective omitted, 28 f.
- adjective, substantivized, 16; 17.
- adj., use of an — instead of an adj.-subst. group, 17.
- adjectives, combination of three —, 24.
- adjectives forming a pair of opposites, 21.
- adjectives indicating a colour, 19.
- adjectives, two —, in succession in order to characterize the non-expressed nominal idea, 24.
- adverb, 36; 78.
- adverb functioning as a predicate, 5.
- adverb implying the idea of "others", 30.
- adverbs expressing relative time, 36.
- alamkāra, 69.
- alliterative combination, 23.
- allusions, 74.
- ambiguity, 74.
- amplification, 12.
- amplified expressions, 11.
- anacoluthon, 25; 68; 72; 75.
- anaphora, 69.
- anaphorical repetition, 77.
- antecedent of a 'relative clause' omitted, 35.
- anticipation, 61.
- antithesis, 20; 70.
- ἀπό κοινού, 14; 15; 36; 45; 47; 63.
- aposiopesis, 45; 49; 60; 66; 71.
- association, semantic, 12.
- asyndeton, 55; 69 f.
- bisemy, 12.
- brachylogy, 5; 25; 34; 43; 50 f.; 52; 55 f.; 57; 65.
- breviloquentia, 14; 57 f.; 59.
- brevity, 61; 70.
- brevity of formulas, 46.
- chiasmus, 66.
- clause to be supplemented, 71.
- colloquial language, 7; 76; 79.
- colloquial speech, 69.
- colloquial usage, 46 f.; 54; 59.
- combinations and complications, 72 f.
- combinations of words, 49 f.
- comparatio compendiarum, 55 f.
- comparison, 50 ff.; 54.
- complementary idea, 47.
- composition of hymns, 49.
- compounds replaced by simple nouns, 57.
- conjunction, 69 f.
- context, 22 f.; 26 f.
- context and situation, 47.
- contracted sentences, 65.
- convenience, metrical, 24.
- conversational style, 46 f.; 53; 59.
- co-ordinated sentences, 48.
- copula absent, 46; 48.
- copulative conjunction, 37.
- correlative demonstrative pronoun wanting, 34 f.
- curtailed forms, 59.
- dative, final, 43 f.
- dative of aim, 49; 76.
- demi mot suffit, 20.
- demonstrative pronoun, 33; 64; 68.
- demonstrative pronoun left unexpressed 33.
- demonstrative pronoun, not repeated, 42.
- demonstrative pronoun suffices, 32.
- derivatives of the same stem or root, 62.
- dichotomy, 12.
- dipaka, 69.

- dissimilation, 60 ff.  
 Dissimilation ganzer Wörter, 60.  
 'double entente', 20.  
 dramatists, 76 f.
- economy, 52 f.; 56 f.  
 ellipsis, 3 ff.; 20; 25; 38; 40; 50; 56;  
 57; 60; 64; 71 f.; 77 f.  
 ellipsis and absolute use of verb, 39.  
 ellipsis, double, 72.  
 ellipsis, petrified, 8; 16.  
 ellipsis proper, 16; 18; 22.  
 ellipsis, technical, 10.  
 ellipsis, unusual instances of, 20 f.  
 elliptic indications of the cosmic space,  
 23.  
 emotion, 46; 49; 76.  
 enallage, 68.  
 epithet, appositive, 24.  
 epithets, 50.  
 exclamations, 46.  
 explication, 63.
- familiarity of the audience with subject  
 or phraseology, 49; 58.  
 formula, 48; 67.
- "genitive as primary", 14.  
 genitive dependent on an absent noun,  
 41.  
 gerund, 58.  
 graphicalness, 49; 54.
- haplological omission, 61 f.  
 haplogy, 15; 41; 62.  
 homogeneity, 30.
- identification, 54 f.  
 idiomatic expression, 46.  
 imperative omitted, 44; 45 f.  
 impressive brevity, 48.  
 inattentiveness, 61.  
 'incomplete' pādas in succession, 74.  
 incompleteness, 80.  
 indeclinable, 47.  
 indicative omitted, 47.  
 infinitive, 43 f.  
 injunction, 44 ff.; 76.  
 instrumental, 4 f.  
 intention of the poet, 79 f.  
 interrogative pronoun, 64.
- uxtaposition, 22.
- Kurzformen, 59.  
 Kürzung, 59.
- lapidary style, 48.  
 literary genre, 46.  
 local adjuncts, 58.  
 locative, 56.  
 logical incompleteness, 50; 53; 56.  
 logical syntax, 61; 73 f.  
 logically incomplete sentences, 75; 76.  
 long and complex sentences, 68 f.  
 luptopamā, 54; 55.
- madhyamapādalopī compound, 59.  
 mantras, esoteric function of —, 51.  
 metaphor, 12.  
 metonymy, 13.  
 metrum, 67.  
 military commands, 43.  
 mood (of verb), 42.  
 'mystic' passages, 27.  
 'mystical or enigmatical brevity', 19 f.
- narrative style, 79.  
 negative particle, 45.  
 negative sentences, 45.  
 neutral expressions, 28.  
 nominal concept, 21; 22; 27.  
 nominal constructions, 60.  
 nominal form, 39.  
 nominal idea, 29 f.  
 nominal polyptoton, 29.  
 nominal sense, a more special, 22.  
 nominal sentence, 47.  
 nominative, 65 f.  
 nominativus pendens, 66; 72; 75.  
 noun to be supplied, 36.  
 noun to be understood from the context,  
 41.  
 nouns translatable by infinitives, 41.  
 numerals, combinations of, 27.
- offenes Kompositum, 54.  
 omission of a proper name, 27.  
 omission of the subject, 25.  
 omission of a substantive, 13; 16; 19 f.;  
 22; 24.  
 'omission' of verb, 45 f.  
 order of words, 36; 37.  
 ordinal numbers, 5.
- parallelism, 67.  
 parenthesis, 20; 53; 64; 68; 75.  
 paronomasia, 20; 40.



- partial anaphoric repetition, 69.  
 participle, 42; 44; 45 f.; 47; 48 f.  
 participle wanting, 77.  
 participles becoming adjectives, 41.  
 particle of comparison, 54 f.  
 perseverance, 61.  
 persona pro re, 56 f.  
 personal pronoun, 33.  
 personal pronoun implying a nominal  
 concept, 32.  
 personal pronoun lacking, 33.  
 personal pronoun, oblique cases of the,  
 34.  
 poetical phrases, 74 f.  
 popular brevity, 78.  
 possessive relation, 32.  
 prayer, 76.  
 pregnant sense, 40; 41; 43.  
 preverb, 77 f.  
 preverb alone, 72.  
 preverb instead of preverb and verb,  
 77 ff.  
 preverb, not repeated, 67; 79.  
 preverb repeated, 69; 77.  
 preverb-adverb, 45; 47.  
 prohibition, 45.  
 pronominal 'antecedent', absence of a,  
 35.  
 pronominal complement of a participle  
 unexpressed, 34.  
 pronominal substitute, 65 f.  
 pronoun, 15.  
 pronoun, as non-expressed complement  
 of a verb, 42.  
 pronoun not repeated, 34; 67.  
 pronoun omitted, 34.  
 pronoun 'wanting', 35.  
 pronoun of the 2nd pers., failing, 33 f.  
 proverb, 74.  
 pseudo-zeugma, 60.  
  
 reciprocity, 29 f.; 64.  
 relative pronoun, 35.  
 relative pronoun, not repeated, 64.  
 relative pronoun suppressed, 36.  
 relief, 31.  
 repetition of clauses or word groups, 66.  
 repetition of the same thought, 64.  
 repetition of the same word in more  
 than one sense, 74.  
 rudimentary syntax, 76 ff.  
  
 Satzasyndeton, 70.  
 Satzparenthese, 58.
- Sāyaṇa, 80.  
 scruples, the influence of, 23.  
 semantic shift, 13; 38.  
 semantic specialization, 11.  
 'shift', 11.  
 shortening, 24 f.; 28.  
 simile, 42; 49; 50 ff.; 60.  
 simile, condensed, 51 f.  
 similes, element missing in both clauses  
 of a —, 53 f.  
 simplex occurring beside compositum,  
 59.  
 'Sondersprache', 9 f.; 19; 38.  
 'Sondersprache', poetical, 49.  
 sophistication, 19.  
 "souci de silence", 23.  
 sous-entendu, 7; 8; 14; 15, n. 50; 15; 17;  
 27; 34; 36; 40; 42; 43; 44; 45; 47;  
 48; 49; 50; 51; 52; 53; 63 ff.; 66;  
 67 f.; 71; 73 f.; 79.  
 sous-entendu reiterated, 64.  
 specialized meaning, 38.  
 stylization, 46 f.  
 subject, changing, 50.  
 'subjectless' third person, 25 f.  
 subordinate clause, 74.  
 subordinate participle, 48.  
 substantivation, 18 f.; 20; 21.  
 substantive, absence of a — expressing  
 a meaning related to that of the  
 verb, 41.  
 substantive, omission of the, 32.  
 syllable dropped by dissimilation, 62.  
 synecdoche, 13.  
 syntactic and metrical unit, 71.  
 syntactic structure of the verse, 37.  
  
 'taboo', 25.  
 taboo for decency's sake, 23 f.  
 taboo, linguistic, 23 f.  
 temporal adverb, 68.  
 tendency to avoid superfluities, 23.  
 tertium comparationis left unexpressed,  
 53.  
  
 unambiguity, 25.  
 upamāna, 51 f.; 54.  
 upameya, 52; 54.  
  
 verb absent, 49; 53.  
 verb and subject deriving from the  
 same root, 40.  
 verb of speaking, thinking etc., 58.  
 verb of subordinate clause, 58.

- verb of subordinate clause absent, 48.  
 verb omitted, 45 ff.; 65; 66.  
 verb or predicate without a complement, 31.  
 verb, position of, 42.  
 verb to be taken in a double sense, 53.  
 verb used absolutely, 68.  
 verb without a complement, 58.  
 verbal adjective absent, 44.  
 verbal asyndeton, 67.  
 Verbalellipsis, 47 f.  
 verbless structure, 78 f.  
 verbs expressing will or intention, 42 f.  
 verbs of wishing, praying etc., 48.
- versification, 24; 49; 59; 61; 67.  
 vivid imagination, 54.  
 vocative and nominative, 75.  
 voces mediae, 28.
- word in another number omitted, 64.  
 word groups, 38.  
 Worthaplogie, 62.  
 Wort- oder Satzhaplogie, 60.
- yathā clause, 53.
- zeugma, 45; 53; 55; 59 f.; 72.  
 zeugma avoided, 60.

INDEX OF SANSKRIT TEXT-PLACES

|                    |           |            |        |
|--------------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| AV. 6, 19, 1 f.    | 40        |            |        |
| 6, 142, 2          | 53        |            |        |
| Aśv. Saund. 15, 14 | 35        |            |        |
| RV. 1, 4, 4        | 31        |            |        |
| 1, 7, 2            | 21        |            |        |
| 1, 8, 6            | 71        |            |        |
| 1, 9, 2            | 64        |            |        |
| 1, 10, 1           | 18        |            |        |
| 1, 10, 2           | 69        |            |        |
| 1, 12, 4           | 17        |            |        |
| 1, 14, 6           | 78 f.     |            |        |
| 1, 15, 1 ff.       | 71        |            |        |
| 1, 15, 6           | 70        |            |        |
| 1, 18, 1           | 29        |            |        |
| 1, 18, 8           | 64        |            |        |
| 1, 25, 3           | 21        |            |        |
| 1, 25, 21          | 64        |            |        |
| 1, 26, 2           | 4         |            |        |
| 1, 26, 7           | 59        |            |        |
| 1, 26, 10          | 30        |            |        |
| 1, 30, 2           | 74        |            |        |
| 1, 30, 13          | 21        |            |        |
| 1, 30, 17          | 74 f.     |            |        |
| 1, 31, 5           | 36        |            |        |
| 1, 32, 15          | 31        |            |        |
| 1, 33, 3           | 43        |            |        |
| 1, 33, 11          | 22        |            |        |
| 1, 35, 4           | 59        |            |        |
| 1, 35, 6           | 35        |            |        |
| 1, 36, 8           | 21        |            |        |
| 1, 36, 9           | 33        |            |        |
| 1, 36, 13          | 29 f.; 42 |            |        |
| 1, 37, 12          | 36        |            |        |
| 1, 38, 2           | 65        |            |        |
| 1, 38, 13          | 45        |            |        |
| 1, 38, 14          | 51        |            |        |
| 1, 42, 1           | 73        |            |        |
| 1, 44, 5           | 21        |            |        |
| 1, 44, 10          | 68 f.     |            |        |
| 1, 47, 7           | 29        |            |        |
| 1, 49, 1           | 22        |            |        |
| 1, 51, 4           | 10        |            |        |
| 1, 51, 8           | 45        |            |        |
| 1, 51, 10          | 14        |            |        |
| 1, 51, 12          | 17; 41    |            |        |
| 1, 51, 15          | 4         |            |        |
| 1, 52, 5           | 61 f.     |            |        |
| 1, 52, 9           | 26        |            |        |
| 1, 54, 1           | 59        |            |        |
|                    |           | 1, 54, 4   | 54     |
|                    |           | 1, 54, 9   | 28     |
|                    |           | 1, 56, 3   | 56     |
|                    |           | 1, 57, 1   | 43     |
|                    |           | 1, 57, 2   | 53     |
|                    |           | 1, 57, 3   | 31     |
|                    |           | 1, 59, 7   | 23     |
|                    |           | 1, 61, 7   | 63     |
|                    |           | 1, 62, 8   | 50     |
|                    |           | 1, 62, 11  | 33     |
|                    |           | 1, 63, 3   | 33     |
|                    |           | 1, 63, 8   | 5      |
|                    |           | 1, 64, 3   | 4      |
|                    |           | 1, 64, 12  | 43 f.  |
|                    |           | 1, 64, 13  | 30     |
|                    |           | 1, 66, 8   | 47     |
|                    |           | 1, 68, 1   | 41     |
|                    |           | 1, 68, 6   | 42     |
|                    |           | 1, 69, 10  | 26     |
|                    |           | 1, 70, 10  | 53 f.  |
|                    |           | 1, 71, 10  | 5; 52  |
|                    |           | 1, 72, 10  | 19     |
|                    |           | 1, 79, 1   | 17     |
|                    |           | 1, 79, 2   | 23     |
|                    |           | 1, 84, 17  | 67     |
|                    |           | 1, 84, 20  | 31     |
|                    |           | 1, 88, 2   | 30; 31 |
|                    |           | 1, 88, 6   | 73     |
|                    |           | 1, 90, 7   | 73     |
|                    |           | 1, 92, 5   | 54     |
|                    |           | 1, 94, 15  | 54     |
|                    |           | 1, 95, 1   | 19 f.  |
|                    |           | 1, 100, 4  | 67     |
|                    |           | 1, 100, 5  | 31     |
|                    |           | 1, 102, 4  | 28     |
|                    |           | 1, 103, 4  | 75     |
|                    |           | 1, 104, 5  | 27     |
|                    |           | 1, 104, 6  | 20     |
|                    |           | 1, 104, 7  | 45     |
|                    |           | 1, 105, 1  | 26     |
|                    |           | 1, 105, 3  | 18     |
|                    |           | 1, 105, 6  | 5      |
|                    |           | 1, 105, 8  | 60     |
|                    |           | 1, 105, 10 | 20     |
|                    |           | 1, 111, 3  | 17     |
|                    |           | 1, 112, 1  | 27     |
|                    |           | 1, 112, 3  | 21     |
|                    |           | 1, 113, 8  | 53     |
|                    |           | 1, 115, 2  | 22     |

|            |        |           |           |
|------------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| 1, 116, 7  | 55     | 1, 180, 5 | 21        |
| 1, 117, 4  | 79     | 1, 181, 4 | 15        |
| 1, 117, 5  | 27; 63 | 1, 183, 2 | 17        |
| 1, 119, 8  | 27     | 1, 186, 8 | 53        |
| 1, 120, 12 | 40     | 1, 187, 5 | 66        |
| 1, 121, 5  | 17     | 1, 187, 6 | 26        |
| 1, 122, 2  | 30     | 2, 1, 5   | 62        |
| 1, 122, 5  | 72; 76 | 2, 3, 2   | 10        |
| 1, 122, 8  | 73     | 2, 11, 11 | 34        |
| 1, 123, 7  | 67     | 2, 11, 15 | 68        |
| 1, 123, 10 | 34     | 2, 13, 7  | 31        |
| 1, 124, 13 | 42     | 2, 13, 9  | 14        |
| 1, 125, 4  | 55     | 2, 14, 8  | 18 f.     |
| 1, 125, 5  | 19     | 2, 14, 9  | 12        |
| 1, 127, 2  | 54     | 2, 17, 1  | 68        |
| 1, 127, 3  | 68     | 2, 18, 8  | 52        |
| 1, 127, 5  | 22     | 2, 19, 2  | 76        |
| 1, 128, 2  | 66     | 2, 23, 16 | 29        |
| 1, 128, 3  | 21     | 2, 24, 7  | 79        |
| 1, 128, 4  | 21; 28 | 2, 24, 10 | 14        |
| 1, 128, 6  | 58     | 2, 24, 11 | 29        |
| 1, 129, 10 | 57     | 2, 24, 14 | 26        |
| 1, 130, 3  | 50 f.  | 2, 25, 1  | 11        |
| 1, 134, 1  | 28     | 2, 27, 3  | 31        |
| 1, 135, 9  | 66     | 2, 28, 7  | 34        |
| 1, 136, 3  | 38     | 2, 30, 9  | 47        |
| 1, 140, 7  | 20     | 2, 31, 7  | 43        |
| 1, 141, 5  | 24     | 2, 32, 2  | 28        |
| 1, 141, 6  | 62     | 2, 34, 10 | 79        |
| 1, 143, 3  | 62     | 2, 35, 14 | 62        |
| 1, 144, 5  | 23     | 2, 36, 1  | 26        |
| 1, 147, 1  | 15 f.  | 2, 38, 4  | 23        |
| 1, 147, 3  | 31     | 2, 38, 8  | 66        |
| 1, 151, 1  | 57     | 2, 39, 3  | 10        |
| 1, 151, 8  | 29     | 3, 1, 1   | 74        |
| 1, 152, 5  | 31     | 3, 1, 11  | 74        |
| 1, 158, 4  | 21     | 3, 2, 9   | 29        |
| 1, 159, 3  | 67     | 3, 3, 6   | 33        |
| 1, 162, 7  | 22     | 3, 6, 9   | 75        |
| 1, 164, 17 | 19     | 3, 8, 1   | 13, n. 40 |
| 1, 164, 25 | 31     | 3, 8, 10  | 22        |
| 1, 164, 30 | 21     | 3, 14, 7  | 17        |
| 1, 166, 8  | 22     | 3, 18, 2  | 28        |
| 1, 167, 6  | 58     | 3, 18, 4  | 77        |
| 1, 167, 7  | 30     | 3, 22, 4  | 48        |
| 1, 168, 1  | 31     | 3, 31, 5  | 37        |
| 1, 169, 1  | 66     | 3, 31, 15 | 10        |
| 1, 171, 5  | 10     | 3, 32, 3  | 70        |
| 1, 173, 1  | 68     | 3, 32, 13 | 37        |
| 1, 173, 6  | 30     | 3, 34, 3  | 15        |
| 1, 173, 12 | 45     | 3, 39, 1  | 32        |
| 1, 180, 2  | 14     | 3, 40, 2  | 28        |
| 1, 180, 4  | 73     | 3, 51, 8  | 76        |

|           |                |                      |        |
|-----------|----------------|----------------------|--------|
| 3, 51, 10 | 72             | 6, 6, 2              | 21     |
| 3, 52, 1  | 24             | 6, 6, 4              | 19     |
| 3, 57, 4  | 80             | 6, 6, 7              | 22     |
| 3, 81, 9  | 17             | 6, 9, 2              | 65     |
| 4, 1, 1   | 58             | 6, 10, 5             | 77     |
| 4, 1, 5   | 68             | 6, 12, 2             | 10     |
| 4, 1, 9   | 40             | 6, 15, 14            | 29     |
| 4, 1, 14  | 70             | 6, 17, 6             | 22     |
| 4, 2, 16  | 76             | 6, 17, 8             | 41     |
| 4, 2, 18  | 76             | 6, 18, 10            | 73     |
| 4, 15, 1  | 55             | 6, 22, 6             | 73     |
| 4, 16, 2  | 26             | 6, 25, 2             | 73     |
| 4, 17, 11 | 69; 72; 74; 77 | 6, 25, 6             | 22     |
| 4, 19, 7  | 68             | 6, 29, 4             | 36     |
| 4, 21, 8  | 70             | 6, 31, 3             | 37     |
| 4, 55, 2  | 40             | 6, 45, 9             | 21     |
| 4, 56, 3  | 23             | 6, 48, 11            | 67     |
| 5, 2, 9   | 80             | 7, 34, 5             | 63     |
| 5, 5, 4   | 72             | 7, 48, 1             | 63     |
| 5, 6, 1   | 69             | 7, 63, 3             | 54     |
| 5, 6, 6   | 76             | 7, 64, 1             | 72; 75 |
| 5, 7, 2   | 67             | 7, 86, 5             | 49     |
| 5, 11, 17 | 36             | 8, 1, 32             | 15     |
| 5, 13, 1  | 64             | 8, 5, 1              | 27     |
| 5, 15, 2  | 21             | 8, 6, 34             | 57     |
| 5, 18, 3  | 27             | 8, 9, 21             | 63     |
| 5, 21, 3  | 26             | 8, 23, 11            | 72     |
| 5, 26, 2  | 5              | 8, 48, 10            | 27     |
| 5, 37, 3  | 27             | 8, 103, 11           | 52     |
| 5, 41, 2  | 35             | 9, 6, 2              | 9      |
| 5, 41, 9  | 29             | 9, 61, 22            | 75     |
| 5, 42, 5  | 15             | 9, 71, 4             | 13     |
| 5, 45, 2  | 10             | 9, 79, 2             | 11     |
| 5, 45, 9  | 5              | 9, 102, 3            | 27     |
| 5, 48, 3  | 34             | 9, 107, 8            | 13     |
| 5, 52, 11 | 58             | 9, 109, 7            | 13     |
| 5, 53, 2  | 68             | 10, 14, 3            | 69     |
| 5, 53, 7  | 68             | 10, 15, 1            | 77     |
| 5, 53, 10 | 68             | 10, 17, 1            | 8      |
| 5, 54, 2  | 72             | 10, 97, 19           | 32     |
| 5, 54, 4  | 77             | 10, 106, 1           | 26     |
| 5, 59, 1  | 70             | 10, 111, 3           | 9; 32  |
| 5, 71, 3  | 68             | 10, 115, 3           | 51     |
| 5, 74, 10 | 71             | 10, 130, 1           | 8      |
| 5, 75, 2  | 70             | 10, 147, 5           | 39     |
| 5, 77, 1  | 40             | 10, 149, 1           | 23     |
| 5, 85, 4  | 67             | Kāl. Pur. 1, 100, 13 | 14     |
| 5, 87, 4  | 73             | 2, 3, 104            | 14     |
| 6, 1, 3   | 5              | TS. 3, 4, 1, 4       | 35     |
| 6, 2, 1   | 52             | 6, 2, 4, 4           | 26     |
| 6, 2, 9   | 73             | VājS. 20, 37         | 10     |
| 6, 3, 5   | 40             | ŚB. 14, 9, 1, 7      | 14     |

INDEX OF SANSKRIT WORDS

|                     |              |                      |        |
|---------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------|
| <i>agni-</i>        | 11           | <i>dhāra-</i>        | 11     |
| <i>aj-</i>          | 9            | <i>dhārapūta-</i>    | 9      |
| <i>ajara-</i>       | 22           | <i>dhūmaketunā</i>   | 24     |
| <i>adya</i>         | 37           | <i>dhmātar-</i>      | 12     |
| <i>adri-</i>        | 11           | <i>na</i>            | 54; 55 |
| <i>anta-</i>        | 10           | <i>namas-</i>        | 4; 12  |
| <i>anya-</i>        | 30           | <i>nābhi-</i>        | 10     |
| <i>apas</i>         | 12           | <i>nītya-</i>        | 74     |
| <i>apām (napāt)</i> | 13           | <i>nu</i>            | 37     |
| <i>abhika-</i>      | 11           | <i>patnī-</i>        | 13     |
| <i>aram-kr-</i>     | 39           | <i>payas-</i>        | 12     |
| <i>arṇa-</i>        | 59           | <i>paridhi-</i>      | 12     |
| <i>avi-</i>         | 13           | <i>pinvate</i>       | 21     |
| <i>ahan-</i>        | 11           | <i>piśaṅga-</i>      | 19     |
| <i>āhuta-</i>       | 9; 62        | <i>punar omitted</i> | 37     |
| <i>iti</i>          | 8 f.; 38; 58 | <i>purā</i>          | 5      |
| <i>itthā</i>        | 47 f.        | <i>purohita-</i>     | 9      |
| <i>indu-</i>        | 11           | <i>puṣṭi-</i>        | 10     |
| <i>iyam</i>         | 32           | <i>pūta-</i>         | 18     |
| <i>iva</i>          | 54           | <i>prakhāda-</i>     | 11     |
| <i>iha</i>          | 45           | <i>prataraṇi-</i>    | 19     |
| <i>uṣarbudh-</i>    | 19           | <i>pra-śams-</i>     | 39     |
| <i>ūrjam</i>        | 5            | <i>prasarsrāna-</i>  | 12     |
| <i>ūrmī-</i>        | 11           | <i>budhna-</i>       | 10     |
| <i>ṛñj-</i>         | 62, n. 190   | <i>brhat-</i>        | 13     |
| <i>ṛta-</i>         | 5            | <i>bhaga-</i>        | 9      |
| <i>eta-</i>         | 13           | <i>bhrṣṭi-</i>       | 12     |
| <i>eva</i>          | 36           | <i>math-</i>         | 9      |
| <i>kuvid aṅga</i>   | 45           | <i>madira-</i>       | 18     |
| <i>kr-</i>          | 60           | <i>madhu-</i>        | 16     |
| <i>gaṇa-</i>        | 10           | <i>mandasāna-</i>    | 12; 13 |
| <i>gantū-</i>       | 11           | <i>mandin-</i>       | 18     |
| <i>goghnam</i>      | 21           | <i>mandra-</i>       | 59     |
| <i>camasa-</i>      | 13           | <i>mā</i>            | 45; 71 |
| <i>cikītvān</i>     | 42           | <i>mātar-</i>        | 13     |
| <i>jana-</i>        | 30           | <i>mānuṣa-</i>       | 16     |
| <i>janiman-</i>     | 13           | <i>yajña-</i>        | 10     |
| <i>takṣ-</i>        | 40           | <i>yajñīya-</i>      | 19     |
| <i>tad</i>          | 68           | <i>yat</i>           | 63     |
| <i>tapus-</i>       | 10           | <i>yathā</i>         | 35     |
| <i>tamas-</i>       | 13           | <i>yadādam</i>       | 8      |
| <i>tarat-</i>       | 41           | <i>yāman-</i>        | 9      |
| <i>turīyam</i>      | 5            | <i>yoga-</i>         | 59     |
| <i>tvac-</i>        | 59           | <i>ratha-</i>        | 59     |
| <i>tveṣas-</i>      | 5            | <i>rātin-</i>        | 12     |
| <i>dakṣat</i>       | 21           | <i>ru-</i>           | 14     |
| <i>div-</i>         | 13           | <i>rudra-</i>        | 4      |
| <i>dirghāhan-</i>   | 11           | <i>ruṣati-</i>       | 19     |
| <i>dhātar-</i>      | 12           | <i>rohita-</i>       | 16     |



|                  |        |                    |        |
|------------------|--------|--------------------|--------|
| <i>vadhri-</i>   | 5      | <i>śās-</i>        | 60     |
| <i>varivas-</i>  | 12     | <i>śukra-</i>      | 18     |
| <i>vaś-</i>      | 43     | <i>saṅgama-</i>    | 11     |
| <i>vahni-</i>    | 11     | <i>sadma-</i>      | 11     |
| <i>vāñī-</i>     | 11     | <i>santi-</i>      | 73 f.  |
| <i>vidathya-</i> | 21     | <i>samudra-</i>    | 12     |
| <i>vidhat-</i>   | 41     | <i>sahūṭī</i>      | 30     |
| <i>viśva-</i>    | 32; 58 | <i>sānu-</i>       | 12     |
| <i>visras-</i>   | 12     | <i>suta-</i>       | 16; 18 |
| <i>vīti-</i>     | 59     | <i>somya-</i>      | 18     |
| <i>vṛjana-</i>   | 11     | <i>stu-</i>        | 41     |
| <i>vedhas-</i>   | 28     | <i>hari-</i>       | 16     |
| <i>śams-</i>     | 39 f.  | <i>hāriyojana-</i> | 57 f.  |
| <i>śardha-</i>   | 10     |                    |        |

INDEX OF GREEK AND LATIN TEXT-PLACES

|                    |       |                         |       |
|--------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|
| Arist. Av. 274     | 46    | O.C. 1441               | 45    |
| Eur. I.A. 926      | 14    | O.R. 430                | 46    |
| Hdt. 3, 88         | 15    | Thuc. 4, 130, 2         | 25    |
| Hes. Op. 515       | 7; 50 | Cicero, Tusc. 5, 20     | 35    |
| Hom. $\Delta$ 447  | 69    | C.I.L. 13, 1983         | 14    |
| <i>H</i> 401       | 35    | Hor. Carm. 1, 35, 22    | 57    |
| <i>I</i> 47        | 14    | Peregr. Aeth. 9, 7      | 25    |
| <i>I</i> 319       | 17    | Plaut. Aul. 712         | 78    |
| <i>I</i> 450 f.    | 65    | Bacch. 455              | 46    |
| <i>K</i> 542       | 8     | Capt. 226               | 25    |
| <i>N</i> 95        | 44    | Merc. 1003              | 34    |
| <i>N</i> 287       | 25    | M.G. 446                | 34    |
| <i>O</i> 328       | 29    | M.G. 450                | 34    |
| <i>P</i> 51        | 55    | Poen. 764               | 35    |
| $\Sigma$ 96        | 57    | Tac. Ann. 4, 40         | 57    |
| $\Phi$ 191         | 53    | Ter. Ad. 582            | 14    |
| $\alpha$ 301       | 74    | Ter. Andr. 175          | 8     |
| $\varepsilon$ 213  | 17    | Andr. 361               | 46    |
| $\iota$ 140 f.     | 65    | Andr. 907               | 47    |
| $\iota$ 366 f.     | 32 f. | Eun. 88                 | 46    |
| $v$ 197            | 8     | Eun. 317 ff.            | 76 f. |
| Isaeus 6, 44       | 25    | Tertullianus, Scorp. 12 | 22    |
| N.T. 1 Cor. 10, 24 | 25    | Verg. Aen. 2, 311 f.    | 57    |
| Plato, Phaed. 59B  | 79    | 4, 39                   | 6     |
| Soph. Ant. 441     | 46    | 11, 632                 | 29    |
| Ant. 577           | 45    |                         |       |

INDEX OF OTHER WORDS

|                      |        |                         |       |
|----------------------|--------|-------------------------|-------|
| 'after'              | 57     | Fr. <i>chambre</i>      | 10    |
| 'also'               | 37; 38 | Fr. <i>on</i>           | 52    |
| 'always'             | 37     | German <i>es</i>        | 68    |
| <i>a Croesus</i> ,   | 54     | Gr. <i>ἀνα</i>          | 44    |
| 'formerly'           | 37     | <i>αὔτως</i>            | 8     |
| 'like'               | 38     | <i>δεῦρο</i>            | 44    |
| 'only'               | 37     | <i>μή</i>               | 45    |
| Dutch <i>het</i>     | 68     | Lat. <i>Anno Domini</i> | 57    |
| Eng. <i>flour</i>    | 10     | <i>deserere</i>         | 9     |
| Eng. <i>leather</i>  | 12     | <i>ducere</i>           | 40    |
| Eng. <i>new-born</i> | 37     | <i>femina</i>           | 17 f. |
| Eng. <i>stone</i>    | 11     | <i>obire</i>            | 40    |
| Eng. <i>that of</i>  | 55     | Span. <i>lista</i>      | 10    |
| Fr. <i>celui de</i>  | 55     |                         |       |

