

ADVERBIAL ACCENT SHIFT IN VEDIC SANSKRIT

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of Cornell University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Emily Laura Barth

December 2018

© 2018 Emily Laura Barth
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ADVERBIAL ACCENT SHIFT IN VEDIC SANSKRIT

Emily Laura Barth, Ph.D.

Cornell University 2018

A hypothetical process of ‘adverbial shift of accent’ is universally assumed, e.g. by Grassmann (1873), Lanman (1880), Whitney (1889), and as recently as Gotō (2013), to explain the irregular accent of several dozen Vedic case-forms in adverbial use, which are differentiated from non-adverbial comparanda by a contrast in accent. The pool of affected forms is so morphologically wide-ranging and inconsistent that it is difficult to define the rules and distributional restrictions of the supposed process. For example, adv. *dravát* ‘at a run, quickly’ beside *drávant-* ‘running’ appears to show rightward accent shift to a suffix. But among numerous adverbial neuter accusative participles, only *dravát* (and possibly *patayát* ‘in flight’) shows any trace of abnormal accent. Likewise loc. sg. *upāké* ‘close by’ apparently shows adverbial accent shift onto a case ending, contrasting with several attested forms in a barytone stem *úpāka-* ‘neighboring(?)’. But adverbial accent shift cannot explain the oxytone accent of an unambiguously adnominal form *upākáyos* (RV I.81.4). Nor can it account for the semantic change that accompanies the leftward accent ‘shift’ from inst. sg. *divā* ‘through heaven’ to *dívā* ‘by day.’ Other forms show additional formal irregularities beyond the accent that must be explained before we may reasonably suppose that a shift of accent has occurred.

In many individual cases, traditional analyses that rely on ‘adverbial accent shift’ have been rejected in favor of more concrete explanations, but this has not led to a systematic reappraisal of adverbial accent shift itself. In other cases, the persistent assumption that any adverbial case-form in the language may be targeted for a contrastive shift of accent—as if by a suppositious [+adverb] feature—has forestalled further morphological investigation into a number of formally ambiguous or problematic adverbs. In this dissertation I argue that the data does not support a generalized rule of adverbial accent shift that is either inherited or synchronically active in Vedic. The majority of purported examples are better explained as derived adverbs in accented suffixes, as old retentions that maintain the original accent of synchronically remodeled paradigms, or as analogical innovations based on accentually regular models. By providing alternative analyses for key cases I show that we must either eliminate ‘adverbial accent shift’ entirely, or at least severely limit its scope of application within the Vedic grammar to concrete analogical scenarios.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Emily Barth was born in Latrobe, Pennsylvania on June 8, 1987 and grew up in southwestern Pennsylvania. In May 2009, she received a Bachelor of Arts degree from Georgetown University with a double major in Linguistics and Classical Languages. She earned a Master's degree in theological studies from Boston University in May 2012. In fall 2012 she began as a graduate student at Cornell University.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many thanks are owed to my committee, for their patient support as I changed the original premise of this dissertation entirely. To my chair, Michael Weiss, for shepherding me through the process with invaluable suggestions for improvement; to Alan Nussbaum, for helping me make sense of an overwhelming profusion of data in the early stages and directing me toward several key solutions; and to John Whitman, for his encouragement and accommodating spirit. I am also grateful to Stephanie Jamison, for suggesting several data points that I had missed and for providing thorough answers to my questions of interpretation and analysis.

I am also grateful to my cohort crew, in particular to Robin Karlin for commiserating and celebrating during the final stretch. Thanks also to my fellow students of historical linguistics, Chelsea Sanker, Ryan Hearn, and Francesco Burroni, for keeping the enthusiasm alive. Many thanks to Cara DiGirolamo, for being a sounding board to my developing thoughts and theories, for lending a friendly ear throughout triumphs and setbacks, and for laughing with me over countless baffling verses about sacred cows and butter. And of course, eternal thanks to my parents, Larry and Linda Barth, for continually assuring me that they would still love me if I ever decided to give up on this project entirely and run for the hills.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Biographical Sketch	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vii
List of Abbreviations	viii
Preface	x
Introduction	1
1 The adverbial suffix <i>-vát</i>	8
1.1 The data: <i>-vát</i> adverbs in the Rigveda	9
1.2 Formal properties of <i>-vant-</i> stems	15
1.3 Semantics of ‘having <i>x</i> ’ → ‘like <i>x</i> ’	22
1.4 Routes of analogical extension	28
1.5 Conclusion	32
2 Adverbial participles in <i>-át</i>	33
2.1 Adverbial <i>nt</i> -participles	34
2.2 <i>dravát</i>	42
2.2.1 Background	42
2.2.2 <i>dravát</i> as an <i>*(E)t</i> -stem abstract	46
2.3 Analogical extension to <i>patayát</i>	51
2.4 Conclusion	54
3 ‘Thematic’ adverbs in productive suffixes	55
3.1 Adverbs in $^{\circ}ay\acute{a}$ and $^{\circ}uy\acute{a}$	56
3.1.1 Background	57
3.1.2 Alternative analyses	60
3.2 Adverbs in productive <i>-tarám/-tarām</i>	63
3.2.1 <i>-tarám</i> as an adverbial suffix	65
3.2.2 Adverbial <i>-tarām</i> and <i>-tamām</i>	68
3.2.3 <i>prathamám</i> and <i>pratarám</i>	70
3.3 Conclusion	73
4 Adverbs in $^{\circ}c\acute{a}$ and thematic $^{\circ}āká-$	74

4.1	Adverbs in thematic ° $\bar{V}k\acute{a}$ - stems	74
4.1.1	Barytone <i>úpāka</i> - in context	78
4.1.2	Barytone <i>ápāka</i> - in context	81
4.2	Adverbs in instrumental ° $c\acute{a}$	86
4.2.1	Characteristics of - <i>añc</i> - stems	87
4.2.2	Adverbial <i>nīcā</i> and <i>prācā</i>	92
4.2.3	Accent remodeling in - <i>añc</i> - stems	96
4.2.4	Adverbs in - <i>cā</i> , - <i>cāt</i> , - <i>cais</i>	98
4.3	Conclusion	103
5	‘Accent-shifted’ adverbs from thematic case-forms	105
5.1	Background and distribution	106
5.2	Prevalence of instrumental - <i>ā</i>	109
5.3	Thematic adverbs in - <i>ā</i> with descriptive accent shift	114
5.3.1	<i>dakṣiṇā</i> , <i>dakṣiṇé</i>	114
5.3.2	<i>madhyā</i> and <i>ubhayā</i> (-)	116
5.3.3	<i>adharā</i> (-), <i>adharāt</i> and <i>uttarāt</i>	118
5.3.4	<i>samanā</i>	122
5.3.5	<i>amā</i> , <i>amāt</i>	122
5.4	Adverbial suffix - <i>ā</i>	124
5.4.1	Adverbial suffixes - <i>tā</i> s, - <i>trā</i> ... and - <i>ā</i> ?	124
5.4.2	Analogical model 1: <i>antar-ā</i> (cf. <i>án-tara</i> -)	127
5.4.3	Analogical model 2: <i>madhyā</i> and <i>ubhayā</i> < *- <i>ayā</i>	129
5.4.4	Extension to other case endings	130
5.5	‘Accent-shifted’ thematic adverbs without models in - <i>ā</i>	131
5.5.1	<i>aparām</i> , <i>aparāya</i>	131
5.5.2	<i>paré</i>	133
5.5.2	<i>sanāt</i>	136
5.6	Conclusion	137
6	Leftward accent shift	139
6.1	‘Contrastive’ accent shift	140
6.2	Weak correlation between adverbial function and accent	144
6.2.1	<i>dīvā</i>	144
6.2.2	<i>kṣāpas</i> and <i>kṣāpā</i>	147
6.2.3	<i>tānā</i>	151
6.3	Isolated instrumentals from verbal roots	152
6.3.1	<i>gūhā</i> and <i>mṛṣā</i>	153
6.3.2	<i>sácā</i>	159
6.4	Leftward shift in other stem types	159
6.4.1	<i>ṛdhat</i>	160
6.4.2	<i>símā</i>	160
6.4.3	<i>didṛkṣu</i>	162

6.5 Conclusion	163
Conclusion	165
Bibliography	167
Index of forms	179

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3A Comparative & superlative stems from preverbs	69
Table 4A -a(<i>ñ</i>)c- stems with fixed initial accent	89
Table 4B Fixed accent on - <i>ǎ</i> (<i>ñ</i>)c- (= - <i>ǎ̃</i> -a(<i>ñ</i>)c-)	89
Table 4C Accent mobility between - <i>á</i> (<i>ñ</i>)c- and ending	90
Table 4D Stems in - <i>dri-añc</i> - & - <i>dhri-añc</i> -	91
Table 5A RV sequences of directional ablative adverbs	119
Table 5B Accent in derived - <i>tas</i> , - <i>trǎ</i> , - <i>ā</i> adverbs	125

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

LANGUAGES

Ved.	=	Vedic
Av.	=	Avestan
YAv.	=	Younger Avestan
OAv.	=	Old Avestan
Gk.	=	Greek
Dor.	=	Doric Greek
Lat.	=	Latin
Arm.	=	Armenian
Olc.	=	Old Icelandic
OIr.	=	Old Irish
ME	=	Middle English
PDE	=	Present Day English

VEDIC/SANSKRIT TEXTS

AitB	=	Aitareya-brāhmaṇa
AV	=	Atharva-Veda
ĀpŚ	=	Āpastamba-śrautasūtra
ĀŚ	=	Āśvalāyana-śrautasūtra
Br.	=	Brāhmaṇa
M.	=	Manusmṛti
Mhb.	=	Mahābhārata
MS	=	Maitrāyaṇī-saṃhitā
RV	=	Ṛg-Veda
ŚB	=	Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa
ŚāṃB	=	Śāṃkhyāyana-brāhmaṇa
TB	=	Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa
TS	=	Taittirīya-saṃhitā
VS	=	Vājasaneyi-saṃhitā
KŚ	=	Kātyāyana-śrautasūtra

GREEK AND ROMAN TEXTS

Hom.	=	Homer
Pi. <i>I.</i>	=	Pindar, <i>Isthmian Odes</i>
Plin. <i>Nat.</i>	=	Pliny, <i>Naturalis Historia</i>
Soph.	=	Sophocles
Strab. <i>Geo.</i>	=	Strabo, <i>Geographica</i>
Ter. <i>Hec.</i>	=	Terence, <i>Hecyra</i>
Verg. <i>A.</i>	=	Vergil, <i>Aeneid</i>

GRAMMATICAL LABELS

m.	=	masculine
n.	=	neuter
f.	=	feminine
sg.	=	singular
du.	=	dual
pl.	=	plural
nom.	=	nominative
acc.	=	accusative
inst.	=	instrumental
abl.	=	ablative
gen.	=	genitive
dat.	=	dative
loc.	=	locative
adj.	=	adjective
adv.	=	adverb
PN	=	personal name
ppl.	=	participle
prn.	=	pronoun
deriv.	=	derivative
subst.	=	substantive
indecl.	=	indeclinable
pres.	=	present

GRAMMARS & TRANSLATIONS

- AiG = Wackernagel & Debrunner, *Altindische Grammatik* (4 vols.)
- comm. = Jamison, *Rigveda Translation: Commentary*, 2-18-18
- EWA = Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen* (2 vols.)
- Geldner = Ge. = *Der Rig-Veda aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt*
- Grassmann = Gr. = *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*
- Grdr² = Brugmann, *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, 2nd edition, vol. 2.2
- J&B = Jamison & Brereton, *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*
- KEWA = Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen* (4 vols.)
- LIV = Rix, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*
- Whitney = Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, 2nd ed.

PREFACE

All translations in the present dissertation are taken from Jamison & Brereton (2014), *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*, unless otherwise indicated. I also extensively consulted Geldner (1951), *Der Rig-Veda aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt* and, in key cases, the commentaries by Oldenberg and Renou. The Sāśa-Pāṭha text is used for all Vedic examples.

INTRODUCTION

When they function as adverbs, a number of case-forms in Vedic Sanskrit contrast accentually with other forms of the same stem. A hypothetical process of ‘adverbial shift of accent’ is used in the literature as a cover-term to explain the odd accentual behavior of these forms. If the literature is to be believed, ‘adverbial accent shift’ applies in a variety of ways to forms of wide-ranging stem types. Most of the adverbs in question appear to be ordinary inflected case-forms of nominal or adnominal stems, and they are identified with particular frequency in the instrumental case. Both rightward and leftward ‘shifts’ have been observed, dependent on the underlying accent of the base form.

(a) RIGHTWARD ACCENT SHIFT ONTO CASE-ENDINGS

amā́ ‘at home’ (cf. *áma-* ‘this’)
nīcā́ ‘downward’ (cf. *nīāñc-* ‘below’)
apākāt́ ‘in the distance’ (cf. *ápāka-* ‘distant’)
adharāt́ ‘from below, from the south’ (cf. *ádhara-* ‘below’)
sanāt́ ‘from of old’ (cf. *sána-* ‘old’)
ubhayā́ ‘on both sides’ (cf. *ubháya-* ‘both’)
naktayā́ ‘by night’ (: **nakt-* ‘night’)
amuyā́ ‘in that way’ (: prn. *amu-* ‘that’)
uttarám ‘hereafter’ (cf. *úttara-* ‘further on, higher’)

(b) LEFTWARD ACCENT SHIFT TO THE ROOT

gúhā ‘in secret’ (cf. inst. *guhā́* ‘by way of a secret place’)
dívā ‘by day’ (cf. inst. *divā́* ‘through heaven’)

Other purported examples of adverbial accent shift—notably adverbs in ‘accusative’ *-vát* and *-tarám*—are best regarded as adverbial derivatives in synchronically productive suffixes. Naturally, the ‘shift’ of accent observed in these forms is strictly rightward. In these cases, the inherent accent of the adverbial suffixes themselves is commonly attributed to an early

application of adverbial accent shift. This ‘shift’ must have taken place prior to the point at which each suffix was grammaticalized as a productive means of deriving adverbs.

(c) RIGHTWARD ACCENT SHIFT ONTO SUFFIXES

aṅgiras-vát ‘like Aṅgiras’ (cf. *áṅgiras-vant-* ‘accompanied by Aṅgiras’)
drav-át ‘quickly’ (cf. ppl. *dráv-ant-* ‘running’)

Looking at the representative forms in (a–c) above, there is no denying that accentual minimal pairs do exist, but beyond this the facts are open to interpretation. It is unclear whether or not there is actually a derivational relationship between each adverb with ‘shifted’ accent and an ‘unshifted’ base form. It is also unclear to what extent, if any, adverbial function is causally relevant to the descriptive accentual distinction. ‘Adverbial function’ is itself notoriously difficult to define, and in the context of so-called adverbial accent it seems to mean whatever is needed on an *ad hoc* basis. The most that can be said with certainty is that adverbial function (of one kind or another) cooccurs with atypical accent (of one kind or another) on a number of occasions. The adverbial case-forms that show some kind of accentual irregularity comprise a group so disparate, however, that the rules or distribution patterns of the hypothetical accent-shift process cannot be restricted in any meaningful way beyond that very vague generalization.

Benfey (1851:1958f.) and Grassmann (1873) both make mention of adverbial accent shift phenomena in Vedic, but neither approaches the data systematically, nor do they commit to a particular analysis. Benfey compares the accent retraction of Greek indeclinable adverbs such as ἄνω ‘upwards’ (cf. ἄνω ‘up’) and κάτω ‘downwards’ (cf. κατά ‘down’) with the “Wechsel des Accents wegen der Adverbialbedeutung” shown by Ved. *divā* (cf. *div-á*). He has little further to say regarding the Vedic forms. Grassmann, meanwhile, is inconsistent in his use of terminology. He often makes no mention of the adverbial status of forms that show a shift of accent, referring

simply to ‘zurückgezogenem Tone’ (as in *dívā*), ‘fortgerücktem Tone’ (*apākāt*), ‘fortgerücktem Accent’ (*amuyā*), or ‘veränderter Betonung’ (*adharāt*, *dravát*). In other cases, he explicitly attributes unexpected accent placement to ‘adverbialer Betonung’ (as in *ubhayā*, *sanāt*), ‘adverbialer Fortrückung des Tones’ (*amā*), or ‘der gewöhnlichen Tonrückung des Adverbs’ (*naktayā*). It is Schmidt (1888) who calls popular attention to adverbial accent shift in Vedic, which he compares with superficially similar accentual alternations in Greek and Balto-Slavic. The comparison is abstract; no cognate adverbs with ‘accent shift’ are shared by the different language branches, nor are the affected forms in Greek and Balto-Slavic as morphologically wide-ranging as those that have been identified in Vedic. Lanman (1880) popularizes the notion of adverbial accent further, identifying most of the examples that are commonly cited to this day. Lanman views adverbial accent shift as a productive morphological process that is capable of moving the accent contrastively either rightward or leftward in order to distinguish adverbially-functioning case-forms from their ordinary, non-adverbial counterparts.

Despite the significant theoretical problems incurred by Lanman’s broad formulation, no systematic rebuttal has been put forth. The adverbial accent ‘analysis’ is maintained without serious criticism by Oldenberg, Whitney, MacDonnell, Renou, Wackernagel & Debrunner, and others, and it is now considered more-or-less standard doctrine. The theory tends only to be challenged vis-à-vis an individual form, if and when a superior analysis is presented to supersede adverbial accent shift *in that particular case*. Otherwise, ‘adverbial accent shift’ is habitually accepted as a satisfactory causal explanation of irregular accent. It seems to me, however, that the label dangerously conflates entirely unrelated surface phenomena that are attributable to unique diachronic scenarios. The problem has been exacerbated by imprecise language and inconsistency in the literature. There has not always been a careful distinction between ‘adverbial

accent’ on the one hand and ‘adverbial shift of accent’ on the other. The two phrasings tend to be used interchangeably, despite having significantly different implications. Whereas the former merely puts a label to a set of descriptive anomalies, the latter makes the unjustified theoretical assumption that adverbial accent shift is a *regular process* in the language at some point. To my knowledge, only Delbrück (1893: 541f.) makes the distinction explicit, when he corrects his own earlier phrasing *Veränderung des Accentus* (‘change of accent’) to *Verschiedenheit des Accentus* (‘difference of accent’), in order to clarify that distinct accent of adverbial forms is not necessarily derived through a productive accent-changing rule that targets adverbs. Delbrück suggests that some oblique case-forms in ablauting paradigms persist as fossilized adverbs after their paradigms are accentually leveled; the difference in accent between the adverbial retention and the case-forms of the synchronic paradigm creates a pattern of accent ‘shift’ that subsequently extends to certain non-ablauting stems through analogy. I believe Delbrück to be at least partially correct in concept, but he offers no further details and overestimates the productivity of the resulting ‘accent shift’ process. Kuryłowicz (1952: 21f.; 1935: 203ff., 244) similarly claims that, in many cases of so-called adverbial accent shift, it is actually the adnominal form whose accent has undergone diachronic remodeling.

Unfortunately, Delbrück and Kuryłowicz are rare exceptions in reconsidering the origins of adverbial accent ‘shift.’ Ill-defined assumptions about the explanatory power of adverbial accent shift continue to thrive due to a general lack of clarity and specificity about the reason for accentual incongruity in the forms listed above and others like them. Given competing morphological analyses of a given form, ‘adverbial accent shift’ is regarded as equal or even preferable to other analyses. For example, even as he rejects it as the explanation of *-vát* adverbs, Pinault (1985: 347) nevertheless accepts that adverbial accent shift is standard doctrine, citing

accounts of that process by Delbrück and Renou. Scarlata (1999: 303) reconstructs **kṣápā* ‘at night’ (: f. *kṣáp* ‘night’) with adverbially shifted accent as the underlying form of the initial compound member in *kṣapāvānt-*, even though he himself acknowledges that the compound is most often analyzed *kṣá-pāvānt-* ‘earth-protector’ (RV III.55.17, VII.10.5, VIII.71.) Jamison (1983: 61, fn. 32) rejects the popular view that *patayát* ‘in flight’ (RV I.4.7) is a truncated compound, preferring Oldenberg’s explanation that “it appears to be an adverbial neuter with expected accent shift.” She has solid contextual reasons for criticizing the compound analysis, but does not initially extend the same skepticism to adverbial accent shift.

Ultimately, discussions of ‘adverbial accent shift’ tend toward circularity. Why does a given form show a shift of accent? Because it is adverbial. How do we know it is adverbial? Because there is a shift of accent. In the absence of meaningful restrictions, adverbial accent is employed as a one-size-fits-all explanation for any accentual irregularity in adverbs without considering viable alternatives or looking at the bigger picture. *guhā* ‘in secret’ (53×, RV II+) is regarded as a root-noun with adverbial accent retraction by Schindler (1972) and Jasanoff (1978 & 2003a), who both disregard the significance of the fact that inst. *guhā́*—the contrasting form on which the entire analysis hinges—is a hapax that appears outside of the family books, and within a stylistic formula to boot. More and more dubious forms are continually added to the ‘accent shift’ roster. Rix (1985:205) reconstructs **téh₂-jo-nt* for *stāyát* ‘secretly’ < ‘as one who steals,’ explaining that “die Akzentverschiebung beim Adverb und natürlich die Ausdrängung des Themavokals beim ‘schwachen’ Stamm des *-nt*-Partizips im Altindischen regulär sind.” Nishimura (2003:118) explains the accent of *g(h)oṣád* ← *ghóṣa-* as comparable to that of *dravát*, *ṭṛpát* et al. “which have originated obviously from the present participle with the change of accent position.” Gotō (2013: 147) accepts without question that “[t]here is a group of adv.s

produced from the pres. part. n. through accent shift” and contributes *dyugát* ‘going through heaven’ to the standard list of accent-shifted participles.

In reality, ‘adverbial accent shift’ is extrapolated from a surprisingly limited data set. Of the extremely abundant case-forms that could be considered adverbial in function, only a tiny fraction are actually distinguished accentually. Moreover, it is far from certain that there is any relationship whatsoever between the various sub-types of affected forms, which are morphologically wide-ranging and share no universal features in common. All told, I have encountered approximately one hundred Vedic case-forms whose descriptively irregular accent has, at some point, been explained as the result of ‘adverbial accent shift.’ That number falls to less than forty, however, if individual adverbs in the productive suffixes *-tarám*, *-vát*, and *-yá* are eliminated from the count. Of the remaining forms, in many cases ‘adverbial accent shift’ has already been rejected and superseded in the literature by a better analysis. If those examples are also discounted, only roughly twenty forms remain, which can be sub-categorized by stem-type: *nt*-participles (~2), thematic adjectives of direction (~14), instrumental root-nouns (~3), and a few anomalous forms like *didṛkṣu* and *drahyát* whose analysis remains uncertain.

In the present dissertation, I have gathered together these many disparate Vedic case-forms that have all been labeled instances of adverbial accent or adverbial shift of accent in previous literature. One-by-one I examine all of these adverbial forms and ultimately conclude that accent shift is never, at any stage, the primary means of derivation. At the very least, the forms cannot be considered outcomes of a single unified process. In chapters §1 and §2, I examine the productive adverbial suffix *-vát* and adverbial participles in *-át*. I argue that in both of these cases, final accent is underlyingly regular in a model form that serves as an analogical basis for the creation of additional adverbs. In chapter §3, I examine adverbs in other productive

suffixes, *-yá* and *-tarám*, which have been mistaken for thematic case-forms. Here, I argue that ‘accent shift’ is an illusion, because these adverbs are unrelated to the thematic adjective stems that they superficially resemble. In chapter §4, I examine adverbs in *°cá* and thematic *°āká-*, which I argue have undergone no shift whatsoever; it is their barytone comparanda, not the oxytone adverbs, that have undergone accentual remodeling. In chapter §5, I examine adverbial case-forms of thematic adjectives of direction, for which I offer several possible alternative explanations. In chapter §6, I examine all purported cases of leftward accent shift, which fail to create a robust pattern of systematic accentual alternation.

CHAPTER 1
THE ADVERBIAL SUFFIX -*VÁT*

In a few cases, descriptive ‘shift of accent’ in adverbs occurs in conjunction with the addition of an overt derivational suffix. The examples that are commonly cited with reference to adverbial accent shift fall into two main groups: productive adverbs in accented *-vát* meaning ‘like *x*,’ and a relatively small number of adverbs in *-át* from endless neuter singular accusative *nt*-participles. This chapter covers adverbs in accented *-vát*, while participial *-át* adverbs will be covered in the next chapter.

The accented suffix *-vát* productively derives adverbs that signify ‘like *x*, as *x* did, in the manner of *x*,’ or ‘as (it was) with *x*.’ These are sometimes referred to as *adverbs of comparison* or *comparative adverbs*¹; the label is accurate inasmuch as they are used to make comparisons, but to avoid confusion with degrees of comparison I will instead use the term ‘equative’ to refer to the *-vát* adverbs under discussion in this chapter. Whitney (§1107, p. 360) recognizes this type as the adverbially-used neuter singular accusative of possessive *-vant-* stems and attributes the suffix accent to an extremely early application of adverbial accent shift. According to Whitney, suffix accent was retained after *-vát* became a productive suffix and lost its original association with *-vant-*stems. The view is by no means universally accepted, but no convincing mainstream theory has yet replaced it. While Hirt (1895: 285) similarly explains *-vát* adverbs as n. sg. acc. case-forms of *-vant-* stems, he claims that *-vant-* stems originally had suffix accent, which is retained only in adverbial forms; the accent of ordinary adjectival *-vant-* stems has been remodeled, creating the synchronic illusion of ‘adverbial accent shift.’ The adverbs in *-vát* are his only evidence for this hypothesis, which he does not further justify. Nor does he explain why the

¹ Whitney (§1233d, p. 420) and MacDonnell (1916: 264) both use this terminology.

accent has shifted leftward in the majority of non-adverbial *-vant-* forms, if suffix accent truly is original.² Wackernagel (1910: 281, fn. 1) rejects any connection between *-vant-* and *-vát* on phonological grounds, but his reasons are unconvincing (see below, §1.2) and he offers no alternative. Largely for reasons of economy it seems to me that the old theory is worth reviving, if its major shortcomings are redressed. The divergent semantics of *-vát* must be accounted for, and more importantly (at least in the context of this dissertation), the theory can also be streamlined to eliminate the need for a superfluous accentual process. I argue that the unique accent and semantics of the *-vát* type can both be traced to a prototype adverb *ṛvát* ‘with strength, in the manner of a man,’ which is associated with an adnominal stem *ṛvánt-* ‘having/accompanied by men; like a man, strong.’ From this form, the accented *-vát* could be extracted as a productive suffix and spread to new forms by analogy.

First in §1.1 I cover the distribution of RV *-vát* forms, in §1.2 I bring to bear the accentual properties of *-vant-*stems, in §1.3 I examine the semantic development of ‘having *x*’ > ‘like *x*’, and finally in §1.4 I offer a theoretical pathway of extension from the likely analogical model *ṛvát* ‘like a man’ to the various other sub-types within the *-vát* class of adverbs.

1.1 The data: *-vát* adverbs in the Ṛgveda

A striking majority of equative *-vát* adverbs are derived from proper names of Vedic ṛṣis. Most that are not derived from ṛṣi names nevertheless derive from words denoting individuals, with only marginal exceptions in late books. A full list of Ṛgvedic equative adverbs in accented *-vát* is shown below, separated by base type³ and arranged in roughly chronological order based on their first attestation. Those that appear in the family books, which comprise roughly half of the

² See Kuryłowicz (1952: 42ff.) for more on this theory, though without significant improvements.

³ A similar list can be found in Pinault (1985: 342), who has already observed the three-way distinction in bases for *-vát* derivatives between (a) proper names of ṛṣis, (b) common nouns, and (c) adjectives.

illustrative forms, are listed first. With a few notable exceptions, most individual *-vát* adverbs are attested only once or twice.

(1) FROM PROPER NAMES

- 20× *manuṣvát* ‘like Manu’ ← *mánuṣ-*, II.5.2, III.17.2, III.32.5, IV.34.3, IV.37.3, V.21.1, VI.68.1, VII.2.3, VII.11.3, I.31.17, I.44.11, I.46.13, I.105.13/14, VIII.27.7, VIII.43.13/27, X.61.15, X.70.8, X.110.8
 1× *manuvát* ‘like Manu’ ← *mánu-*, II.10.6
 9× *aṅgirasvát* ‘like Aṅgiras or his followers’ ← *aṅgiras-*, II.17.1, III.31.19, VI.49.11, I.31.17, I.45.3, I.62.1, I.78.3, VIII.40.12, VIII.43.13
 6× *atrivát* ‘like Atri’ ← *átri-*, V.4.9, V.7.8, V.22.1, V.51.8, V.72.1, I.45.3
 2× *atharvavát* ‘like Atharvan or his followers’ ← *átharvan-*, VI.15.17, X.87.12
 1× *bharadvājavát* ‘like Bharadvāja’ ← *bharád-vāja-*, VI.65.6
 1× *vasiṣṭhavát* ‘like Vasiṣṭha’ ← *vásiṣṭha-*, VII.96.3
 2× *jamadagnivát* ‘like Jamadagni’ ← *jamádagni-*, VII.96.3, IX.97.51
 2× *kaṇvavát* ‘like Kaṇva or the Kaṇvas’ ← *kāṇva-*, VIII.6.11, VIII.52.8
 4× *vyaśvavát* ‘like Vyaśva’ ← *vyaśva-*, VIII.23.23, VIII.24.22, VIII.26.9, IX.65.7
 1× *sthūragūpavát* ‘like Sthūragūpa’⁴ ← *sthūra-gūpa-**, VIII.23.24
 2× *nabhākavát* ‘like Nabhāka’ ← *nabhāka-**, VIII.40.4,5
 1× *mandhātrvát* ‘like Mandhātṛ’ ← *man-dhātṛ-*, VIII.40.12
 1× *bhṛguvát* ‘like Bhṛgu’ ← *bhṛgu-*, VIII.43.13
 1× *apnavānavát* ‘like Apnavāna’ ← *ápnavāna-*, VIII.102.4
 1× *aurvabhṛguvát* ‘like Aurva and Bhṛgu’ ← *aurva-bhṛgu-*, VIII.102.4
 1× *yayātivát* ‘like Yayāti’ ← *yayāti-*, I.31.17
 1× *virūpavát* ‘like Virūpa’ ← *virūpa-*, I.45.3
 1× *priyamedhavát* ‘like Priyamedha’ ← *priyá-medha-*, I.45.3

(2) FROM COMMON NOUNS

- 4-9×⁵ *ṇṛvát* ‘like men, mightily’ ← *ṇṛ-* ‘man,’ III.34.5, IV.22.4, VI.19.1, X.28.12, VI.53.10, [IV.55.4, VI.1.12, VI.19.10, VIII.5.2]
 2× *pitṛvát* ‘like the ancestors’ ← *pitṛ-*, pl. ‘fathers, ancestors,’ VIII.40.12, X.66.14

⁴ The bases *sthūra-gūpa-* and *nabhāka-* are unattested independently of their *-vát* derivatives. Given the prevalence of *-vát* derivatives from proper names, it is a safe assumption that they are to be interpreted as such, especially since both *sthūragūpavát* and *nabhākavát* occur in close proximity to other *-vát* derivatives from unambiguous proper names within the same hymn. However, see Jamison (comm. VIII.23) for the possibility that *sthūra-gūpa-vát* is also a pun, playing on the literal meaning of the basis ‘(having?) sturdy posts.’

⁵ The n. sg. acc. case-form *ṇṛvát* is attested 12× in total, but the precise number of times that it functions adverbially as opposed to adnominally is much debated. No n. sg. acc. referent is available in vv. III.34.5, IV.22.4, VI.19.1, VI.53.10, or X.28.12. Pinault (1985: 354f.) accordingly takes only these to be truly ‘adverbial’ uses: four times meaning ‘like men’ but once in VI.53.10 meaning ‘in the company of men.’ Grassmann on the other hand identifies seven of the attested appearances as adverbial, either ‘*kräftig, tüchtig, reichlich*’ (III.34.5, IV.22.4, VI.1.12, VI.19.1, VI.53.10, X.28.12) or ‘*nach Männer Art*’ (VIII.5.2). Various translators choose divergent interpretations on a case-by-case basis, but always include both adnominal and adverbial readings of *ṇṛvát*.

1× *jānivát* ‘like relatives’ ← *jāmi-*, pl. ‘siblings, blood-relatives,’ X.23.7
1× *ṛṣivát* ‘like the *ṛṣis*’ ← *ṛṣi-* ‘seer, ṛṣi,’ X.66.14

(3) FROM ADJECTIVES

2× *pūrvavát* ‘as of old’ ← *pūrvá-* ‘preceding, early’ (subst. pl. ‘ancestors’), III.2.12, I.31.17
8× *pratnavát* ‘as of old’ ← *pratná-* ‘former, old,’ VI.16.21, VI.22.7, VI.65.6, I.124.9, VIII.13.7, IX.9.8, IX.49.5, IX.91.5
3× *purānavát* ‘as of old’ ← *purāná-* ‘ancient, aged,’ VIII.40.6, VIII.73.11, X.43.9
1× *pākavát* ‘simply, honestly’ ← *pāka-* ‘childlike, simple, ignorant,’ X.100.3

If indeed *-vát* originated as the neuter singular accusative of *-vant*, that association was synchronically opaque. Otherwise, we could expect to see any number of accentually-contrasting pairs consisting of an equative *-vát* adverb alongside a barytone *-vant*-stem, both derived from the same basis. Despite the sizeable number of attested *-vát* adverbs, it is difficult to find evidence of synchronic adverbial accent shift within the paradigm of any *-vant*- derivative; in reality, there are only two *-vát* adverbs that can be associated with corresponding *-vant*-stems.⁶ One of these is the aforementioned *ṇvát* ‘in the manner of a man, mightily,’ which tends not to take part in discussions of adverbial accent shift at all, because no change of accent occurs to indicate adverbial rather than adjectival usage. Accent is fixed on the suffix throughout the paradigm, in adverbial and non-adverbial forms alike. The other example is *aṅgirasvát* ‘like Aṅgiras,’ which does contrast in accent with the barytone adnominal stem *aṅgirasvant-* ‘accompanied by the Aṅgiras’ (nom. sg. II.11.20, VI.17.6; pl. VIII.35.14).

As our only near-minimal pair, it is tempting to take *aṅgirasvát* as a n. sg. acc. case-form within the paradigm of *aṅgirasvant-*, and as evidence of a derivational relationship (with adverbial accent shift) between *-vant*-stems and *-vát* adverbs. But the accent is not the only

⁶ In addition to the two mentioned here, Thomson (1891: 13) mentions a *pūrvavant-* ‘having something preceding’ (VPrāt., Nyāyad., Āp.) which does not occur in an accentuated text, and also *pratnavant-* ‘containing the word *pratna*’ (ŚB), which based on meaning clearly cannot be the basis of the adverb *pratnavát* ‘as of old’ derived through accent shift.

difference between the two forms. The possessive suffix *-vant-* typically derives, from a basis ‘*x*,’ an adnominal meaning ‘having *x*’ in which the accent remains on its underlying position in the simplex stem. This holds true in the case of *āṅgirasvant-*, a standard possessive adjective. As can be seen in the list above, however, adverbs in *-vát* are distinct from ordinary *-vant-* stems not only by their suffix accent, but also by their ‘equative’ semantic specialization. These adverbs are used to equate an action in the present with the same action as it was undertaken by different participants on a previous occasion, usually in a ritual context.

- (4) *tát asmai návyam aṅgirasvát arcata*
śúṣmāḥ yát asya pratnáthā udīrate (II.17.1ab)

‘As did the **Aṅgiras**, chant this new (chant) to him, so that his explosive powers rise up as in ancient times’⁷

- (5) *yáthā áyajah hotrám agne pṛthivyāḥ*
yáthā diváh jātavedaḥ cikitvān
evá anéna haviṣā yakṣi devān
manuṣvát yajñám prá tira imám adyá (III.17.2)

‘Just as you performed the sacrificial role of the Hotar of the Earth, o Agni, and just as you observantly (performed that) of the Heaven, Jātavedas, so sacrifice to the gods with this offering. **Like Manu**, carry out this sacrifice today.’

More often than not, the agent of the present action takes on the same role as the historical individual whose name provides the basis of the *-vát* derivative. In such cases the adverb forms a simple equation that can be translated ‘as *x* did’ or simply ‘like *x*,’ as is seen in the above examples. Note that although it is useful short-hand to translate *-vát* adverbs in this way, these options do not convey the full semantic range expressed by equative *-vát* adverbs built to ṛṣi names. Though all express comparisons, they are not always strictly adverbs of manner, but must sometimes be interpreted with an oblique case relationship, e.g. ‘as by *x*, as was done to/for *x*.’

⁷ All translations are taken from Jamison & Brereton (2014), *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*, unless otherwise indicated.

This is especially true of *-vát* adverbs in later books. On account of this complication, Pinault (1985: 360ff.) argues that *-vát* adverbs primarily express temporal comparison, indicating ‘as happened/as was done in the time of *x*.’ But while later adverbs can be used with more flexibility, the base is unambiguously to be understood in the subject role in a clear majority of the earliest forms (as in §4–5).⁸ I see no problem with taking ‘like *x*, as *x* did’ as the earliest meaning available for *-vát* adverbs. Subsequently their range of possible meanings widened to permit oblique case relationships under a more general sense of ‘as in the case of *x*’ and, by implication, ‘as at the time of *x*.’ Any temporal reading comes for granted from the continual use of historical figures as bases. ‘As Manu did,’ for instance, naturally brings with it a comparison of past and present, simply by virtue of Manu’s mytho-historical import. It is unnecessary to take the variable semantics of later *-vát* derivatives into account when attempting to identify the ultimate origin for the suffix, as the various developments are extensions of what remains, in essence, a comparison between individuals in ritual roles.

- (6) *manuṣvát indra sávanam juṣānáḥ*
pībā sómam śásvate vīryāya
sáḥ á vavṛtsva haryaśva yajñáih
saranyúbhiḥ apáḥ árṇā sisarṣi (III.32.5)

‘As by Manu, o Indra, enjoying the pressing, drink the soma for manly power ever new. Let yourself be turned hither by our sacrifices, you of the fallow bays. Along with the hastening ones, you set to running the flooding waters’

- (7) *á yuvānaḥ kavayaḥ yajñīyāsaḥ*
márutaḥ gantá grṇatáḥ varasyám
acitrám cit hí jinvathā vṛdhántaḥ
itthá náḡsantaḥ naraḥ aṅgirasvát (VI.49.11)

⁸ This is the clear reading for seven of the nine times *manuṣvát* is used in the family books, for example, and is the likeliest reading as well of *manuvát* in II.10.6 (though Delbrück says otherwise; see fn. 22). Though it is not always clear whether an adverbial or adnominal interpretation is to be preferred, *ṇvát* ‘manfully, in a manly manner’ is exclusively used to modify the manner in which the subject performs the main action, in any situation where it can be interpreted adverbially.

‘You youths, poets deserving the sacrifice, you Maruts—come hither in response to the singer’s longing for space, for you in your strength quicken even (a place) without brightness, approaching in just the same way **as to Aṅgiras**, you superior men.’

- (8) *priamedhavát atrivát*
jātavedaḥ virūpavát
aṅgirasvát mahivrata
praskaṇvasya śrudhī hávam (I.45.3)

‘**As in the case of Priyamedha, of Atri, of Virūpa**, o Jātavedas, **as of Aṅgiras**, o you of great commandment, hear the call of Praskaṇva.’

Comparable developments of ‘equative’ semantics are rarely observed in *-vant-*stems outside of this particular class of adverbs. Though *indravant-* (IV.37.5) is glossed ‘like Indra’ by Grassmann and Whitney, it is better taken as an ordinary possessive ‘accompanied by Indra’.⁹ Whitney also offers *-vant-* adjectives from pronominal stems, such as *tvāvant-* ‘like you,’ *māvant* ‘of my sort,’ etc., as a parallel semantic development. But despite the superficial similarity, their morphology cannot be compared with *-vant-*stems; see §1.3 below. The aforementioned *ṛṣvánt-*, which as an adnominal can mean either ‘having/accompanied by men’ or ‘like a man, strong,’ may be the only example of its kind in Vedic.¹⁰

In relying on ‘adverbial accent shift’ to explain the origin of *-vát* adverbs, Whitney fails to fully account for the significant semantic deviation that exceptionlessly accompanies the so-called shift of accent. But his failure to explain it does not mean that no explanation is possible. Given the overall shortage of *-vant-* adnominals directly corresponding to *-vát* adverbs, we are already working under the assumption that *-vát* somehow became an independently productive suffix at a relatively early stage, but precisely how that occurred has never been explored in detail. We don’t need evidence that *-vant-* derivatives ever underwent systematic accent shift or

⁹ Following Geldner, Renou, J&B.

¹⁰ Its exceptional status would be lessened or even eliminated if the root *ṛṣ-*, which provides the basis of the *-vant-*stem, is to be taken not with the substantive sense ‘man’ but instead as an abstract ‘manliness.’ If that is the case, the equative semantics of ‘like a man, strong’ are only trivially distinct from the underlying possessive meaning ‘having manliness.’ This possibility will be discussed in §1.3.

developed equative semantics on a widespread level. We only need to identify a single early model *-vant-* stem where both of these occurred, and whose neuter singular accusative could be used as a prototypical *-vát* adverb. As it happens, we have already seen one form that fits all of the criteria. Suffix accent and equative semantics are independently motivated in *nyvánt-*, from which an equative adverb *nyvát* (III+) is derived. This unique form has the proper phonological and semantic properties to have served as an analogical model from which accented *-vát* was extracted and spread, as an inherently accented derivational suffix, to form the whole class of indeclinable equative adverbs listed above in (§1–3).

I will begin to demonstrate this in section §1.2 with an explanation for the underlying oxytone accent of *nyvánt-* and some observations on how *-vát* adverbs differ from ordinary possessive *-vant-* derivatives with respect to stem formation.

1.2 Formal properties of *-vant-* stems

Some have seized upon the divergent properties of possessive *-vant-* and adverbial *-vát* as evidence against any morphological relationship between them. The theory that *-vát* ultimately derives from *-vant-* has been rejected on formal grounds by Wackernagel (1910) and on additional semantic grounds by Pinault (1985: 355), who insists “Le rattachement de *-vát* à *-vant-* possessif paraît impossible, en raison de la différence des valeurs.”¹¹ But while I agree with Wackernagel and Pinault that the traditional view does not entirely satisfy, for reasons of economy it is premature to entirely abandon *-vant-* as a point of origin for *-vát*, as long as a new explanation can be supplied for both its unique semantics and, of course, its accent.

¹¹ Ultimately Pinault (p. 364ff.) suggests that the *-vát* class may have originated as determinative compounds with the second member an endingless loc. of the root-noun **uét-* ‘year,’ such that these adverbs would originally mean something more like ‘as in the time of X’.

As a general rule, the accent in ordinary *-vant-* possessives remains on its original position in the basis stem. But as already mentioned, there is a regular exception to this determined by the stem type of the base. The accent shifts to *-vant-* when the suffix is added to stems ending in short accented *í*, (*ú*), *ǰ* and *ǰ́*, and also when it is added to monosyllabic stems.¹² The R̥gvedic forms that show this are relatively few in number, and they are listed by stem type under (§9).¹³ Note that the derivatives from *n*-stems are built to stem-final *-an-* rather than zero-grade *-a-*, which differentiates them from *-vát* adverbs. This applies regardless of the accent in the original *n*-stem (c.f. *ásman-* ‘stone’ → *ásmanvant-* ‘having stones, stony’).

(9) OXYTONE DERIVATIVES IN *-vant-*

arcí-, m. ‘ray, flame’ → *arcivánt-* ‘blazing’
agní-, m. ‘fire’ → *agnivánt-* ‘having or maintaining a fire’
rayí-, m. ‘property’ → *rayivánt-* and *revánt-* ‘having property or prosperity, rich’

akṣán-, n. ‘eye’ → *akṣaṇvánt-* ‘having eyes’
asthán-, n. ‘bone’ → *asthanvánt-* ‘having bones’
ātmán-, m. ‘breath, soul’ → *ātmanvánt-* ‘having a soul, alive’
udán-, n. ‘water’ → *udanvánt-* ‘watery, abounding in water’
dadhán-, n. ‘milk curds’ → *dadhanvánt-* ‘containing coagulated milk’
dhvasmán-, m. ‘smoke’ → *dhvasmanvánt-* ‘having smoke, surrounded by smoke clouds’
pūṣán-, m. [proper name] → *pūṣaṇvánt-* ‘accompanied by Pūṣan’

nǰ́-, m. ‘man, manliness’ → *nǰ́vánt-* ‘men, manly’

dát-, m. ‘tooth’ → *datvánt-* ‘having teeth, biting’
pád-, m. ‘foot’ → *padvánt-* ‘having feet, running’

The list above includes no *-vant-* stems derived from *u*-stems, because stems in final *ũ* take the sister-suffix *-mant-* almost without exception. The only R̥gvedic *ũ*-stems with derivatives in

¹² Kuryłowicz (1952: 42ff.), AiG II/2 883f. and Whitney (§1233, p. 419f.) Presumably *-vant-* derivatives from stems in short accented *ú* would follow suit, but none are attested, as all such stems take *-mant-* instead.

¹³ The accent is exceptionally drawn to the suffix in three additional derivatives: *aṣṭhīvánt-* ‘kneecap, knee’ VII.50, X.163.4, *viṣūvánt-* ‘in the middle’ I.84.10, I.164.43, i.e. ‘having different sides’ (EWA II 565), *somāvánt-* ‘having soma’ X.97.7, for which see AiG II/2 884. An explanation for these forms, which show other formal irregularities in addition to the accent, is beyond the scope of the current investigation.

possessive *-vant-* are *viṣṇuvant-* ‘accompanied by Viṣṇu’ and *viṣūvánt* ‘in the middle,’ as opposed to 29 *ũ*-stems in *-mant-*. The two sister-suffixes are distributed more evenly with *ĩ*-stems, of which 29 take *-vant-* and 25 take *-mant-*.¹⁴ The accentual properties of *-mant-* stems are identical to those of *-vant-* stems. Without exception, *-mant-* draws the accent when suffixed to oxytone short *í-* and *ú-* stems; representative examples are provided in (§10). Otherwise the accent remains in its original position in the basis.

(10) OXYTONE DERIVATIVES IN *-mant-*

arci-, m. ‘ray, flame’ → *arcimánt-* ‘shining, blazing’
nidhí-, m. ‘treasure’ → *nidhimánt-* ‘possessing treasure’
puṣṭí-, f. ‘growth, increase’ → *puṣṭimánt-* ‘thriving, prosperous’

ketú-, m. ‘bright appearance, clearness’ → *ketumánt-* ‘having brightness, clear’
dyú-, m. ‘light, brightness’ → *dyumánt-* ‘bright, loud, conspicuous, strong’
dhenú-, f. ‘milch cow’ → *dhenumánt-* ‘rich in cattle’

Equative *-vát* adverbs systematically violate several of the regular rules for the formation of *-vant-* derivatives, which are otherwise strictly adhered to. As short *ũ*-stems, *mánu-*, *bhṛḡu-*, and *aurva-bhṛḡu-* would be expected to take *-mant-* rather than *-vant-*, yet they form the bases for *manu-vát*, *bhṛḡu-vát*, and *aurvabhṛḡu-vát*. From an *n*-stem, *atharvavát* (: *athárvan-*) is exceptional among *-vant-* stems inasmuch as it is built to the regular zero-grade *-a-*; the regular *-vant-* derivative would be *atharvanvant-*.^{*} For Wackernagel, all of these exceptions constitute overwhelming evidence against the theory that adverbial *-vát* originates in possessive *-vant-*.¹⁵

But the data strongly suggest that equative adverbs are formed throughout the RV by adding the

¹⁴ The distribution is observable, but less strict with consonant stems that have non-final *u* in the final syllable; e.g. in *-mant-* are *virúkmant*, *garútmant*, *vihútmant*, *kakúdmant*, *vidyúnmant*, *mīdhūṣmant*, *cákṣuṣmant* but in *-vant-* are *niyútvant* and *marútvant*. Occasionally an individual *i*-stem makes derivatives in both suffixes, e.g. *arcimánt-* ‘shining, blazing’ X.61.15 = *arcivánt-* VII.81.24, IX.67.24-.

¹⁵ Wackernagel (1910: 281, fn. 1). His idea is staunchly maintained in AiG II/2 876, where “Die Adverbia auf *-vát* haben mit *-vant-* nichts zu tun” is all that is said on the subject. Wackernagel offers no alternative theory about the origin of *-vát*, noting only “Auch ist mit der Möglichkeit zu rechnen, daß das *t* von *-vat* auf *d* oder *dh* zurückgeht.”

accented suffix *-vát* directly to a nominal stem, without the need for an intermediary *-vant-* adjective. These ‘exceptions’ could simply be taken as evidence that, already by book II of the *Ṛgveda*, *-vát* derivatives had been synchronically dissociated from *-vant-* stems. Neither the conditioned alternation between *-vant-* and *-mant-* nor the idiosyncratic zero-grade of *n*-stems operates as a phonological rule across the language; both are specific to the *-vant-* morpheme. This being the case, adverbs in *-vát*—including some forms that would indeed be exceptional among *-vant*-stems, such as *manuvát* and *atharvavát*—were simply never subject to these rules in the first place.

However, this cannot be equally true for all forms. If there is a genuine historical relationship between *-vát* and *-vant-*, then as ordinary case-forms the earliest *-vát* adverb(s) would have been subject to the regular rules of *-vant*-stem formation. As we attempt to identify an analogical model for the *-vát* class, we can eliminate from consideration any forms that violate those rules. Of course, suffix accent alone distinguishes most *-vát* adverbs from ordinary *-vant*-stems, which is the entire premise of the ‘adverbial accent shift’ claim addressed in this chapter. But there are actually several forms in *-vát* whose suffix accent is completely regular, whether they are analyzed as adverbs in productive *-vát* or as genuine *-vant*-stems, functioning adverbially in the neuter singular accusative. Taking into account that stems in accented final *ṛ* and *í* make adnominal *-vant-* derivatives with suffix accent as a rule, suffix-accented *ṛvát* (: *ṛ-*), *pitṛvát* (: *pitṛ-*), *jānivát* (: *jāni-*), and *mandhātṛvát* (: *mandhātṛ-*) are perfectly well-formed under either analysis.¹⁶ Despite the formal ambiguity, it is nevertheless clearly best to take the latter three of these as adverbs in productive *-vát* rather than as case-forms of *-vant-* derivatives. This is primarily due to the fact that they share the equative semantics of the *-vát* type, which is otherwise difficult to explain. They are also hapaxes with no independent evidence

¹⁶ This observation is made already by Thomson (1891: 13) with regard to *ṛvát* and *pitṛvát*.

of corresponding *-vant*-stems, and they appear quite late, well after the suffix had clearly become productive. The situation with *ṛṣvát*, however, is quite different.

Adnominal, suffix-acented *ṛṣvánt-* ‘having men; like a man, having manliness’ (22×, III+) is attested throughout the family books with a full paradigm of case-forms. N. sg. acc. *ṛṣvát* itself is attested twelve times in the RV, both as an adverb and as an ordinary adnominal with a neuter singular referent. This alone distinguishes it from every other *-vát* adverb. The precise number of times that it functions adverbially as opposed to adnominally is open to interpretation; various translators choose divergent interpretations on a case-by-case basis, but always include both adnominal and adverbial readings of *ṛṣvát* (see fn. 5). *ṛṣvát* is also atypical among the earlier equative *-vát* adverbs—though in this regard it is perfectly ordinary among *-vant-/mant-* stems—in having a nominal root \sqrt{nr} as its basis. While there are a few comparable examples in *pitr-vát*, *ṛṣi-vát* and *jāmi-vát*, none of these appear in the earlier family books, and they are easily taken as late innovations modeled after the productive *ṛṣi*-based *-vát* type, especially as they occur in similar ritual contexts:

- (11) *evá indrāgnibhyām pitrvát návīyaḥ*
mandhātrvát aṅgirasvát avāci (VIII.40.12ab)

‘Thus to Indra and Agni, **in the manner of the ancestors, of Mandhātar, of Aṅgiras**, a newer (speech) has just been spoken.’

- (12) *vāsiṣṭhāsaḥ pitrvát vācam akrata*
devān īlānāḥ ṛṣivát svastāye
prītāḥ iva jñātāyaḥ kāmam étya
asmé devāsaḥ áva dhūnutā vásu (X.66.14)

‘The Vasiṣṭhas have made speech **in the manner of their father**, invoking the gods **in the manner of that seer** for well-being. Like pleased kinsmen, coming here at our desire, shake good things down upon us, o gods.’

Other adverbially-used *-vant-/-mant-* stems from common nouns do exist outside of the indeclinable equative *-vát* class, and they provide valuable context for our understanding of *ṅrvát*. A small number of case-forms in *-vat* and *-mat* are used as adverbs in the family books, with barytone accent. These are unambiguously neuter singular accusatives of *-vant-/-mant-* stems, of which other case-forms are attested. They each observe the regular morphophonological rules of formation for stems of this kind, including the rule for maintaining the accent of the basis.

(13) BARYTONE POSSESSIVE ADVERBS IN *-vat/-mat*

- ámavat* ‘impetuously’ V.58.1 (: *ámavant-* 16×, IV+ ← *áma-*, m. ‘violence, strength’, cf. YAv. *amauuant-*)
krátumat ‘with strength’ II.23.15 (: *krátumant-* 7×, II+ ← *krátu-*, m. ‘power’)
barháṇāvat ‘with strength, mightily’ III.39.8 (: *barháṇāvant-* 2×, III+ ← *barháṇā-*, f. ‘might’)
sáhasvat ‘with strength’ I.6.8 (: *sáhasvant-* 19×, II+ ← *sáhas-*, n. ‘strength, force’)

It is telling that these *-vat/-mat* adverbs which lack ‘adverbial’ suffix accent also lack an equative semantic specialization. In each of these examples, the *-vant-/-mant-* suffix is added to an abstract nominal base, which results in a possessive adjective denoting characteristics or qualities. This can be used adnominally but also, in the n. sg. accusative, as an adverb of manner. These forms demonstrate that under ordinary circumstances, n. sg. acc. *-vant-/-mant-* stems can be used adverbially without any changes in form to overtly signal a functional change from adnominal to adverb; in other words, no additional ‘adverbial accent shift’ is required. This should not be surprising, as the neuter singular accusative is frequently employed adverbially throughout the language without any formal distinction.

On the other hand there are also at least two cases, *revát* and *dyumát*, where we have n. sg. acc. adverbs from *-vant-/mant-* stems that preserve the standard possessive meaning, but do show suffix accent.

(14) OXYTONE POSSESSIVE ADVERBS IN *-vát/-mát*

dyumát ‘brightly, loudly’ II.23.15 (: *dyumánt-* 64×, II+ ← *dív-/dyú-*, m./f. ‘day, light’)
revát ‘bountifully, beautifully’ III.23.2 (: *revánt-* 58×, II+ ← *rayí-*, m./f. ‘wealth, riches’)

These are not counter-examples, however, but merely exceptions that prove the rule. Like *nṛvánt-*, both *dyumánt-* and *revánt-* are well-attested as ordinary *-vant-/mant-* adnominals with suffix accent fixed throughout the paradigm, such that no shift of accent has occurred in the formation of the adverb.¹⁷ That is to say, the only adverbs in suffix-accented *-vát/-mát* that have possessive semantics (‘with *x*; in the manner of one who has *x*’) rather than equative semantics (‘like *x*’) are those whose suffix accent is predictable from the stem type of the basis, and due to regular morphophonological factors.¹⁸

The data in (§13-14) are limited, but entirely consistent. There is no trace of irregular accentual behavior in adverbially-used *-vant-/mant-* stems outside of the homogenous group of forms that also show the equative semantic specialization, which reveals them to be in productive *-vát* rather than derived from *-vant-* stems through accent shift. It can be surmised that ‘adverbial’ suffix accent in *-vát* adverbs has nothing to do with adverbial use, *per se*, and everything to do with the original analogical prototype for the class. Such a prototype should belong to a *-vant-* paradigm whose suffix accent can be attributed to the phonological shape of its

¹⁷ Incidentally, the fact that neither the barytone adverbs under (§13) nor the oxytone adverbs under (§14) show *any* trace of accent shift undercuts the theory that ‘adverbial accent shift’ is contrastive, with the direction of shift contingent upon the accent of the (ad)nominal from which the adverb derives. See chapter §6.

¹⁸ This could account also for *āśu-mát* ‘like a rapid (beast)’ AV 6.105.1-3 ← *āśú-* adj. ‘fast, quick’ as another example parallel to *dyumát*, though from an adjective stem. Thus we avoid the necessity to posit “un glissement isolé de *-vát* en *-mát* d’après les adjectifs en *-mant-*,” as per Renou (1952: 330). But see Wackernagel (1910: 281, fn. 1) for an alternative.

basis. Ideally, it should also be possible to interpret it with equative semantics, in order to explain why all adverbs in productive *-vát* share this defining characteristic. This brings us back once again to *ṅvát*, which belongs to a reasonably well-attested *-vant-* paradigm with fixed suffix accent in full accordance with the regular rules of *-vant-* stem formation. Moreover, while it is commonly used to mean ‘having men, accompanied by men’ in the standard possessive sense, even as an adnominal (and thus, independently of the adverbial derivation process) *ṅvánt-* can also take on an equative meaning ‘befitting a man, manly, like a man,’ i.e. ‘strong.’ Both of these factors make *ṅvát* an ideal candidate for the prototype from which *-vát* was extracted as a suffix and productively spread to new stems and stem types.

1.3 Semantics of ‘having *x*’ → ‘like *x*’

If we are satisfied with identifying the original prototype, then at this point we have already answered the question of how adverbs in *-vát* < *-vant-* have developed the semantic extension of ‘having *x*’ to ‘like *x*.’ If indeed *ṅvát* is the model for *-vát* adverbs as a class, then in a sense their equative meaning comes for granted. It is one of the attested meanings available to the adnominal *-vant-* stem, and the predominant meaning of the neuter singular accusative in particular.

- (15) *yáh vā te sánti dāsúṣe ádhṛṣṭāḥ*
gírah vā yábhiḥ ṅvátīḥ uruṣyáh (VII.3.8ab)

‘Your unassailable (strongholds)—either those which are for your servant or those by which you will make a wide path for our **manly songs**—’

- (16) *sá naḥ vājāya śrávase iṣe ca*
rāyé dhehi dyumátaḥ indra víprān
bharádvāje ṅvátāḥ indra sūrīn
divi ca sma edhi pārye naḥ indra (VI.17.14)

‘Provide our inspired poets with brilliance—for (them to acquire) the prize: fame and refreshment, and wealth, o Indra; at Bharadvāja's (provide) our patrons with **superior men**, o Indra. And, as ever, be there for us, Indra, on the decisive day.’

- (17) *tásmāi ukthám janāye yát jújoṣan*
nṛvát nāvīyah śṛṇávāt yáthā naḥ (VII.26.1cd)

‘For him I beget a **hymn** that he will enjoy, a newer **manly** one, so that he will listen to us.’

- (18) *aneháḥ mitra aryaman*
nṛvát varuṇa śámsyam
trivárūtham marutaḥ yanta naḥ chardīḥ (VIII.18.21)

‘O Mitra, Aryaman, and Varuṇa, o Maruts—your faultless, **manly**, praiseworthy **protection** providing threefold defense – extend that to us.’

Nevertheless, it would be more satisfying to shed some light on how this particular possessive -vant-stem has come to take on equative semantics in the first place, if only to address any suspicions that the adverb *nṛvát* is not a case-form of an ordinary -vant-stem, but some other morphological type entirely.¹⁹

First of all let us eliminate one particular red herring that captivates Whitney’s attention to the exclusion of other, more profitable avenues of inquiry. The equative semantics of -vát adverbs invite a comparison with adjectives a separate group of adjectives in -vant- like *tváv(a)nt-* ‘like you,’ *máv(a)nt-* ‘like me,’ *yáv(a)nt-* ‘how much, as long as, while’ and *táv(a)nt-* ‘so great, so long, to such an extent’ etc.²⁰ These would initially seem to be closely connected with our equative adverbs due to their superficially-identical -vant- formant and shared equative semantics, and indeed Whitney (§1233d, p. 420) conjectures that equative -vát adverbs are “doubtless to be understood as accusative neuter of a derivative of this class.” But their

¹⁹ Which I would argue is, by contrast, the best way to take *āṅgiras-vant-* (a possessive -vant-stem) as opposed to *āṅgiras-vát* (derived from the stem in productive adverbial -vát).

²⁰ From personal pronoun stems after the model of *máv(a)nt-* 9×, IV+ and *tváv(a)nt-* 17×, IV+ we find additionally loc. pl. *yusmávatsu* ‘like you’ II.29.4 and dat. sg. *yuvávate* ‘like you both’ III.62.1. From quantitative pronoun stems like *yáv(a)nt-* 8×, III+ and *táv(a)nt-* 6×, VI+ are the additional forms *etávant-* ‘so great, so often’ 11×, VII+, *ívant-* ‘so great, so splendid’ 8×, IV+, and abl. sg. (*á*) *kívatas* ‘how long, since when’ III.31.17.

explanatory power is limited. Adnominals of this type and with this meaning are exclusively built to pronominal stems, and they never have suffix accent. The accentual disparity might be attributed to adverbial accent shift in the *-vát* adverbs, whereas none of the *-vant-* derivatives from personal pronouns is ever used adverbially. But the barytone accent of adverbial n. sg. acc. *yávat* and *távat* makes for a problematic comparison. Furthermore, the identity of pronominal ‘equative’ *-vant-* with possessive *-vant-* is not supported by comparative evidence. With different outcomes for the two types in Avestan (e.g. OAv. *θβāuuas* ‘like you’ < **-uānt-s*, but OAv./YAv. *astuuā* ‘having bones’ < **-uās*), and with Gk. comparanda ἕως and τέως not lining up with the regular *-εις/-εσσα/-εν* outcome of *-vant-* stems, it is entirely likely that pronominal adjectives in *-vant-* and possessives in *-vant-/-mant-* are inherited from altogether unrelated sources.²¹

This does not rule out the potential for synchronic influence, but regardless, there is no need to rely on the *mávant-* type for the semantics of *-vát*. The equative development can be motivated independently.²² Gk. adjectives in *-εις, -εσσα, εν* corresponding to Ved. *-vant-* provide independent evidence for the potential of that formant to develop a specialized meaning ‘like or resembling *x*.’ Although the vast majority of words in this Gk. suffix mean simply ‘having *x*,’ we also see, for example, κύκλος, m. ‘circle’ → κυκλόεις ‘circular, like a circle’ (Soph.+). This particular example could come to mean ‘circular’ in the possessive sense of ‘having a circle (to

²¹ See Pinault (1985: 349-351), who has covered this point already in some detail. One possibility regarding *távat* and *yávat*, suggested to me by Alan Nussbaum, is to take the fem. inst. of the pronoun **tā* as the starting point. As an adverbial element it is eligible to make a derivative in *-uo-*, cf. Lat. *prā-vus*, Gk. νερός ‘fallow field’ < **neiμός* ‘with a low location.’ The resulting stem **tāuo-* ‘thusly’ could be the basis for a *t*-stem substantive abstract (of the type *udvát-*, f. ‘height,’ *nivát-*, f. ‘depth,’ *pravát-*, f. ‘forward/downward slope; mountain’) meaning something akin to ‘thusly-ness.’ The later insertion of *n* (in the RV, only seen in *tāvan* I.108.2) would be an analogical development.

²² Delbrück (1893: 613f.) credits ambiguous phrasing for *-vát* adverbs coming to mean ‘like *x*.’ He proposes that a phrase such as *manuvád vadema* originally would have meant, “wir möchten etwas zum Menschen Gehöriges (mit dem Menschen Versehenes) reden.” The phrasing in this example, taken from II.10.6, allows for an adverbial reinterpretation “nach Menschen-Art, wie es sich für den Menschen gehört,” which he suggests gave rise to the adverbial *-vát* type as a whole. However, he has (by necessity) chosen a highly atypical example. In practically no other case is it possible to interpret the *-vát* form as a direct object, making it highly unlikely that this actually represents the original state of affairs. He also provides no explanation for the irregular accent.

it), having a perimeter.’²³ Other derivatives in *-εις*, such as those under (§19), more clearly show a distinct development beyond possession to ‘belonging to the category of *x*’ or ‘being like *x*.’

(19) GREEK ADJECTIVES IN *-εις*, *-εσσα*, *εν* (**-uent-*)

μορόεις ‘like mulberries’ ← μόρον, n. ‘mulberry’; ἔρματα τρίγλινα μ. ‘earrings clustering like mulberries’ Hom. *Il.* 14.183, *Od.* 18.298

λειριόεις ‘like a lily’ ← λείριον, n. ‘lily’; χροά λ. ‘lily skin’ Hom. *Il.* 18.830, ὄπα λ. ‘delicate voice’ *Il.* 3.152

χαλαζήεις ‘like hail’ ← χάλαζα, f. ‘hail’; φόνω χ. ‘blood thick as hail’ Pi. *I.* 5.50

This specialized sub-type in *-εις* is invariably adnominal and never accented on the suffix. Nevertheless, these forms demonstrate that it is entirely possible for the underlying possessive semantics of *-vant-* to extend to the meaning ‘having a salient property of *x*’ and therefore ‘resembling or like *x*.’ Numerous adjectives in the Latin possessive suffix *-ōsus* show a similar development, meaning ‘like *x*’ rather than the standard ‘having *x*.’ In Latin *-ātus*, which normally forms possessives along the lines of *barbātus* ‘having a beard’ and *aurītus* ‘having ears,’ we also find *lunātus*, meaning not ‘having a moon’ but rather ‘moon-shaped, crescent.’

(20) LATIN ADJECTIVES IN *-ōsus* & *-ātus*

buxōsus ‘resembling boxwood, the color of boxwood’ ← *buxus*, f. ‘box-tree,’
xylobalsamum b. ‘balsam-wood which resembles boxwood’ Plin. *Nat.* 12.25.54

cadāverōsus ‘like a corpse, cadaverous’ ← *cadaver*, n. ‘corpse,’
c. facie ‘ghastly appearance’ Ter. *Hec.* 441

lunātus ‘moon-shaped, crescent’ ← *lūna*, f. ‘moon,’
l. peltis ‘with moon-shaped shields’ Verg. *A.* 1.490; *l. cornibus* ‘with crescent horns’ Plin. *Nat.* 6.38

²³ Buck & Petersen (1970: 460).

There is evidence in Gk. -εις, Lat. *-ōsus* and *-ātus*, and even Eng. *-ed* and *-ful*²⁴ that suffixes with underlying possessive semantics can and do independently develop secondary equative meanings. But it remains to be shown how the development took place specifically in *ṅrvánt-* itself. Taking the root \sqrt{nr} at face value to mean ‘man,’ in the initial stage as a true possessive *ṅrvánt-* would mean ‘having men’ and therefore ‘accompanied by men.’ The sense of ‘accompanied by *x*’ is well established for possessives built to an animate noun or proper name as a basis. We have already seen this with ṛṣi names that can denote either an individual, or that ṛṣi’s followers and descendants, e.g. *āṅgirasvant-* ‘accompanied by the Aṅgiras.’ From that sense, it is a short but crucial step to ‘in the company of *x*’ and thus ‘with/among *x*,’ by this point in the sense of group identification. Once it signifies ‘belonging to the group of men,’ therefore ‘having the properties of men or man-like’ is the next logical implication.²⁵

- (21) *ṅrvánt-* ‘having men’ and therefore ‘accompanied by men’
 → ‘in the company of men, with the men’
 → ‘of the group of men’
 → ‘having the properties of men, man-like’

Another scenario is made possible if, instead of as a substantive ‘man,’ we interpret the root \sqrt{nr} as an abstract, with the underlying meaning ‘strength, vigor, manliness.’ Nussbaum

²⁴ Compare the meaning of English *-ed* in *dogged, crabbed, shrewd, bigoted* as contrasted with the much more common possessive meaning of *monied, diseased, talented*, etc. Note that a striking parallel to *ṅrvánt-* occurs in English *manful*, which from its earliest attestation means not ‘full of men, having men’ in the ordinary meaning of the suffix *-ful* (cf. *beautiful, graceful*) but rather ‘like a man, possessing the qualities of a man’ after the manner of *masterful, lordful*. This specialized type dates to ME and was never particularly common. Much like the *-vāt* adverbs, it has a strong association with individuals to the exclusion of other base types. Only *manful* and *masterful* are in common use in PDE. Other ME examples are now obsolete and/or rare, having often been superseded by *-ly* adjectives: *lordful, motherful, friendful, enemyful, liegeful, tyrantful, wretchful, fiendful*. One extremely rare case of a ‘like *x*’ adjective in *-ful* that is not formed from a word for an individual is *masque-ful* ‘of the nature of masquerade’ (1655, tr. C. Sorel *Comical Hist. Francion* v. 11): “*There is a great Feast within, full of all maskfull Recreations.*”

²⁵ *pace* Pinault (1985: 355), who contends “il n’ya a pas de lien entre l’adj. *ṅrvánt-* et l’adv. comparatif *ṅrvát*, même par l’intermédiaire d’un adv. *ṅrvát* ‘avec des hommes.’” He goes on to observe rightly, “Il serait évidemment très simple de partir d’un *ṅrvánt-* signifiant ‘pourvu de qualités d’homme’ (bravoure, virilité, etc.),” but in his interpretation “dans tous ses emplois l’adjectif exprime la possession ou la compagnie d’hommes bien réels, qui constituent un des éléments de la richesse et du prestige.” I follow Grassmann, Geldner, J&B in thinking otherwise.

(2007) has shown that there is good reason to postulate a root-noun abstract **h₂ner-* ‘vigor, strength’ beside the root-noun agent **h₂ner-* ‘strong one, man,’ based primarily on its meaning as the second compound member in Greek ἀγήνωρ ‘manly, heroic’ and ἀνήνωρ ‘cowardly.’ (cf. also OIr. *nert* ‘strength’ and Hitt. *innara-* ‘strong, willful’ : *innarahḫ-* ‘strengthen’, *innarā* ‘willfully’). This allows possessive *nṛvánt-* to be viewed as directly comparable to *barhánāvat*, *krátumat* and *sáhasvat*. Functionally all of these are adverbs of manner meaning ‘with strength,’ and formally they are all case-forms of *-vant-*stems derived from more-or-less synonymous abstract bases meaning ‘strength.’ But unlike *barhánā*, *krátu* and *sáhas*, the root $\sqrt{nṛ}$ at the base of *nṛvát* has the potential to be reinterpreted by speakers as a concrete masculine noun. Even if it was originally an abstract meaning ‘strength,’ synchronically it stands next to a great number of compounds in which the first-member *nṛ-* can only be taken as ‘man’ or ‘men,’ e.g. *nṛ-cákṣas-* ‘seeing men,’ *nṛ-páti-* ‘lord of men,’ *nṛ-hán-* ‘killing men,’ etc. In practical terms this is a trivial reinterpretation, since ‘having manliness’ is already semantically equivalent to ‘having the properties of a man’ and therefore ‘like a man,’ which can be used adverbially to mean ‘in a man-like manner.’

- (22) *nṛvánt-* ‘having strength, strong’ (*nṛ* = ‘strength’)
 → ‘having that which is proper to a man’ (*nṛ* = ‘manliness’)
 → ‘manly, like a man’ (*nṛ* = ‘man’)

The crucial change, under this scenario, has less to do with the meaning of the *-vant-*stem and more to do with the synchronic analysis of the word’s composition in the minds of speakers. Reinterpreting the basis as ‘man’ rather than ‘strength, manliness’ is the change that allows for new forms to be created by a four-part analogy *nṛ* ‘man’ : *nṛ-vát* ‘like a man’ :: *x* : *x-vát*, where *x* is the name of an individual, such as *Manu*.

1.4 Routes of analogical extension

However the unique semantics of *nṛvánt-* are explained,²⁶ the fact stands that it independently shows the appropriate semantic specialization to serve as an ideal analogical base for the proliferation of adverbs in accented *-vát* meaning ‘like *x* (did), in the manner of *x*.’ All that remains is to investigate the specifics of how *-vát* could be extracted as a suffix from *nṛvát* and extended to a whole class of derivatives, the overwhelming majority of which are built to names of ṛṣis as bases. To begin with, the semantic domain of the basis *nṛ-* ‘man’ makes *nṛvát* an eminently suitable analogical model for a class of derivatives that built to names and terms for individuals. Strikingly, among the earliest equative adverbs are three which share bases that either mean ‘man’ or could be interpreted as such, under the right conditions: *nṛvát*, *manuṣvát* and *manuvát*. The last of these, *manuvát*, appears only once in II.10.6. On the other hand *nṛvát* and *manuṣvát* appear not only early but repeatedly.

By far the most common *-vát* adverb is *manuṣvát* (23×, II+). Accordingly Pinault (1985: 359ff.) takes it as a starting point for explaining the *-vát* class as a whole, and downplays the relative significance of *nṛvát* due to the many ways in which it is aberrant from the rest of the forms. But I take those aberrations to reflect its independent origin and to support taking it as the original prototype. It is easier and more economical to build other forms from *nṛvát* with complete regularity than it is to explain *nṛvát* as an early, but anomalous creation built on some other model.²⁷ Due to the semantic similarity of *nṛ-* ‘man’ and *mánu-/mánus-* ‘man,’ it is a

²⁶ Either solution incidentally provides an explanation for the puzzling superfluity of *nṛvánt-* ‘manly, strong’ alongside *nárya-* ‘manly, strong.’ From the same root *nṛ-* are derived these two adjectives, the former in a possessive suffix and the latter in a genitival suffix, which under some circumstances have no discernible difference in meaning. The multi-stage semantic developments laid out in (§21) and (§22) demonstrate how a genitival suffix with the underlying meaning ‘having *x*’ should come to converge in meaning with a possessive suffix whose underlying meaning, ‘of *x*,’ is its polar opposite.

²⁷ It is worth recalling that there is a tendency for stems with *u* in the final syllable to take *-m(a)nt-* rather than *-v(a)nt-*, even if the *u* is not stem-final (see fn. 14). *manuṣvát* and *manuvát* both ignore this tendency. *manuṣvát* proves nothing definitively, since the rule does not apply exceptionlessly for stems with non-final *u* as it does for

minimal first step from *ṛj-vát* to *manu-vát/manuṣ-vát*. But while *manuṣ-* is a synonym for ‘man,’ it can also signify ‘Manu,’ the proper name of the mythically personified progenitor of mankind.²⁸ Once there is a frequently-occurring model for equative adverbs with a mytho-historical figure as its basis, namely *manu(ṣ)vát*, from that point the *-vát* suffix may be productively extended to other proper names of Vedic ṛṣis, Aṅgiras being the earliest and most frequent example.²⁹

(23) EXTENSION TO ṛṣI NAMES

<i>ṛj-</i>	:	<i>ṛjvát</i>	::	<i>mánuṣ-</i>	:	<i>manuṣvát</i> (II+)
‘man’		‘in a manly way’		‘man, Manu’		‘in a Manu-like way, as Manu did’
<i>mánuṣ-</i>	:	<i>manuṣvát</i>	::	<i>aṅgiras-</i>	:	<i>aṅgirasvát</i> (II+)
‘Manu’		‘like Manu’		‘Aṅgiras’		‘like Aṅgiras or the Aṅgirasas’

At a later point, the productivity of *-vát* extended further to roots outside the semantic domain of proper ṛṣi names. From adjectives we have a set of three adverbs *pūrvavát*, *pratnavát* and *purāṇavát*, all meaning ‘as of old,’ and also the rather unique *pākavát* ‘simply, honestly, like a child.’ From common nouns are *ṛṣivát*, *pitṛvát* and *jāmivát*. The extension from proper ṛṣi names

genuine *u*-stems, but it is at least consistent with my theory that *manuṣvát* is a very early analogical creation in productive *-vát* rather than the progenitor of the *-vát* class. That is, of course, assuming that the type as a whole originates in *-vant-*, which Pinault (1985: 355) denies. But the current analysis has economy in its favor, over taking *ṛjvát* to be of an unrelated (and as-yet unidentified) morphological type.

²⁸ EWA II 309. Grassmann takes *manuṣvát* as ‘like men’ in half of its appearances, rather than ‘like Manu,’ but this interpretation is rarely adopted by others. Geldner and J&B exclusively interpret the base of *manuṣ-vát* as the personal name Manu.

²⁹ It is additionally noteworthy that *-vát* adverbs frequently co-occur in sequences of two or more, which become particularly common after the family books. Many of the *-vát* adverbs are attested only in sequences such as this, where we can directly observe the analogical models on which they are based.

manuṣvát agne *aṅgirasvát* aṅgiraḥ, *yayātivát* sádane *pūrvavát* ſuce (I.31.17ab)
priyamedhavát atrivát, *jātavedaḥ virūpavát*, *aṅgirasvát* mahivrata (I.45.3abc)
ucchā divaḥ duhitar pratnavát naḥ, *bharadvājavát* vidhaté maghoni (VI.65.6ab)
grṇānā jamadagnivát, *stuvānā ca vasiṣṭhavát* (VII.96.3cd)
evā indrāgnibhyām pitṛvát návīyah, *mandhāṭṛvát aṅgirasvát* avāci (VIII.40.12ab)
utā tvā bhṛguvát ſuce, *manuṣvát* agne āhuta, *aṅgirasvát* havāmahe (VIII.43.13)
aurvabhṛguvát ſúcim, *apnavānavát* ā huve (VIII.102.4ab)
vasiṣṭhāsaḥ pitṛvát vācam akrata, *devān ṛjvát* svastāye (X.66.14ab)

to the common noun *ṛṣi-* requires little explanation, though as a late hapax in book X *ṛṣivát* is of little use in explaining how earlier *-vát* derivatives came to be created from common noun bases. While not obviously related to *ṛṣis*, *pitṛ-* sg. ‘father,’ pl. ‘ancestors’ is nevertheless a noun stem naming individuals. Moreover, in the plural sense of ‘ancestors,’ it can be used in direct parallel with Manu and *ṛṣi* names generally, which all name figures in the domain of the past who participate in sacrificial traditions. Likewise, *pūrvá-* ‘old’ is frequently substantivized in the masculine plural to mean ‘those of old, the ancestors,’ and as such its derivative *pūrvavát* is equivalent in meaning with *pitṛvát* ‘like the ones of old, like the ancestors.’

(24) EXTENSION TO ANCESTRAL COMPARISONS

<i>āṅgiras-</i> ‘Āṅgirasas’	:	<i>āṅgirasvát</i> ‘like the Āṅgirasas’	::	<i>pūrvá-</i> , subst. pl. ‘old ones, ancestors’	:	<i>pūrvavát</i> (III+) ‘like the ancestors’
<i>pūrvá-</i> , subst. pl. ‘old ones, ancestors’	:	<i>pūrvavát</i> ‘like the ancestors’	::	<i>pitṛ-</i> , subst. pl. ‘fathers, ancestors’	:	<i>pitṛvát</i> (VIII+) ‘like the ancestors’

Even more overtly than *-vát* adverbs from proper names of *ṛṣis*, *pūrvavát* and *pitṛvát* are used to equate an action in the present with one performed in the past. The original meaning ‘like the old ones, like the ancestors’ with a substantive basis could conceivably develop into a more generalized meaning, ‘as the old ones did, as it was done in olden times,’ or simply ‘as of old.’ The adverbs from other temporal adjectives take their cue from *pūrvavát*. Even though neither *pratná-* nor *purāṇá-* is ever independently substantivized to mean ‘ancestors,’ this presents little difficulty once *pūrvavát* has lost the sense that the basis is necessarily to be understood as a substantive. It then becomes available as a model for *-vát* adverbs built to purely adjectival stems that share the same basic meaning, ‘old.’

(25) EXTENSION TO TEMPORAL COMPARISONS

<i>pūrvá-</i>	: <i>pūrvavát</i>	::	<i>pratná-</i> , <i>purāṇá-</i>	<i>pratnavát</i> (VI+), <i>purāṇavát</i> (VIII+)
‘old’	‘in the old way, as of old’		‘old’	‘as of old’

The temporal sense is lacking in the remaining Ṛgvedic forms, *jānivát* and *pākavát*. But *pitṛvát* opens the proverbial door to forming equative *-vát* adverbs to other relationship nouns, which can account for *jānivát* ‘like kin’ from the substantive *jāmi-* ‘blood-relative.’ While the stem *pāka-* is only used attributively, the meaning of that particular adnominal stem already denotes a comparison ‘like a child’ (i.e. ‘ignorant, innocent’). This may perhaps have contributed to its use as a base for a derivative type that also signifies ‘like *x*.’ With *purāṇavát* and *pratnavát* opening up the possibility of forming *-vát* adverbs to bases that are unambiguously thematic adjectives, there could even be a more straightforward route of extension if we take *pāka-* ‘young’ to form an antonymic pair with ‘old.’

(26) OTHER LATE EXTENSIONS

<i>pitṛ-</i>	:	<i>pitṛvát</i>	::	<i>jāmi</i>	:	<i>jānivát</i> (X)
‘ancestors, fathers’		‘like (the) fathers’		‘kinsmen’		‘like kinsmen’
<i>pūrvá-</i> et al.	:	<i>pūrvavát</i> et al.	::	<i>pāka-</i>	:	<i>pākavát</i> (X)
‘old’		‘in the old way’		‘child-like’		‘in a child-like way’

At any rate, with the category no longer strictly associated with ṛṣi names, at this point in Book X the productivity of *-vát* was clearly opening up to a much greater variety of bases. That trend continues in the post-Ṛgvedic period, yielding such fanciful new creations as *kākatālīyavat* ‘after the fashion of the crow and the palm-fruit’ in Classical Sanskrit.³⁰

³⁰ Whitney (§1107, p. 360).

1.5 Conclusion

Accented *-vát* productively creates new adverbs from nominal (and later, adjectival) stems, but adverbs in *-vát* were never directly formed from the neuter singular accusative of barytone *-vant-* stems by accent shift as the mechanism of derivation. Suffix accent and equative specialization, both of which are characteristic of productive *-vát* adverbs, are independently motivated in *nṛvát* from possessive *nṛvánt-*. With a basis *nṛ-* ‘man,’ *nṛvát* has the appropriate semantic and formal features to serve as an analogical base for the proliferation of adverbs in *-vát* that are predominantly formed to names of ṛṣis and other words denoting individuals. We do not need to theorize another, separate origin for a synchronically identical *-vat* morpheme, and we certainly do not need to invoke the theoretically cumbersome ‘adverbial shift of accent’ process to account for the origin of suffix-accented equative *-vát* adverbs.

On a final note, there is always a possibility that a relationship could have been recognized between adverbial *-vát* and the n. acc. sg. in *-vat* of possessive *-vant-* stems, and it could have been synchronically reinterpreted as a shift of accent to mark ordinary case-forms for adverbial use. But I think this highly unlikely, based on the additional semantic specialization involved and also on the near-total lack of *-vant-/vát* pairs. If *-vát* adverbs were synchronically interpreted as *-vant-* stems with ‘adverbial accent shift,’ then we might reasonably expect to see, as a consequence of this, a modest proliferation of suffix-accented adverbs from barytone possessive *-vant-* stems, and also perhaps the occasional *-vant-* stem back-formed from a *-vát* adverb. The fact that we see neither indicates to me that members of the *-vát* class were treated as nothing more than adverbs in a productive, synchronically isolated, and inherently accented suffix.

CHAPTER 2
ADVERBIAL PARTICIPLES IN *-ÁT*

There are a number of adverbs in *-at* or *-át* from verbal roots, which are for the most part analyzed as n. acc. sg. *nt*-participles. It has been noted that some of these adverbs, especially or exclusively those with accent on the final syllable, contrast accentually with the ordinary participle. For this reason, they have been identified as cases of ‘adverbial accent shift’ from the verbal root to the participial suffix. Adverbial *dravát* ‘at a run, quickly’ is frequently cited to demonstrate this, because it forms an accentual minimal pair with an attested participle stem *drávant-* ‘running, quick’ (cf. *drávati*). But it is virtually the only secure example of its kind. Adverbs in *-at/-át* make up a formally ambiguous and haphazard collection of forms, and most are either accentually unremarkable if analyzed as n. sg. acc. participles, or show a greater degree of formal irregularity than ‘accent shift’ alone can account for. Since the semblance of productive adverbial accent shift in this morphological category is restricted to one or two outliers, I think that a critical re-appraisal of *dravát* et al. is long past due. At the very least, we must address the broader theoretical implications of attributing their exceptional behavior to a supposedly language-wide process of adverbial accent shift.

Toward that end, I give an overview of the data in §2.1 and distinguish the adverbial participles in *-át* whose accent is irregular and noteworthy from those for which final-syllable accent is completely regular. In §2.2, I analyze adverbial *dravát* (cf. ppl. *drávant-*) as an *-(E)t-* stem abstract derived from a de-verbal thematic adjective. In §2.3, I propose that adverbial *patayát* ‘in flight’ can be explained as an analogical formation on the model of *dravát*. I conclude in §2.4 that it is unnecessary to invoke a hypothetical (and uneconomical!) process of adverbial accent shift in order to account for any of the adverbs in *-at/-át*.

2.1 Adverbial *nt*-participles

Lanman (1880: 507) and Whitney (§1111e, p. 361f.) both suggest that *dravát* ‘quickly’ and possibly *drahyát* ‘steadfastly’ show a change of accent to signify adverbial use. In this they agree with Grassmann, who identifies *dravát* as a participle of \sqrt{dru} “mit veränderter Betonung” and *drahyát* as an irregularly built pres. ppl. of $\sqrt{dṛh}$. Wackernagel (1918: 394f.) includes both of these within a short list of lexicalized oxytone adverbs in °*át*, which he collects together as formal comparanda for a late form *īṣát* ‘a little’ (ŚBr.+).

(27) WACKERNAGEL’S ADVERBS IN PARTICIPIAL -*át*

dravát ‘quickly, speedily’ I.2.5, I.44.7, III.35.2, VI.45.32, VII.10.2, VIII.5.7, VIII.49.5,
cf. *drávati* ‘run’, ppl. *drávant-* (\sqrt{dru})
dhṛṣát ‘boldly’ I.54.4, VI.42.3, VI.45.21, VI.47.6, VIII.21.2, VIII.32.4, VIII.33.3, VIII.49.4,
cf. *dhṛṣámāna-* ‘be bold’, them. aor. ppl. *dhṛṣánt-* ($\sqrt{dhṛṣ}$)
tṛpát ‘full, to satiety’ II.11.15, II.22.1, II.36.5, III.32.2, X.116.1,
cf. *tṛpṇóti* ‘be satisfied’ ($\sqrt{tṛp}$)
patayát ‘in flight’ I.4.7, cf. *patáyati* ‘fly’, ppl. *patáyant-* (\sqrt{pat})
drahyát ‘firmly, steadfastly(?)’ II.11.15, cf. pres. *dṛhyati* ‘be firm’ ($\sqrt{dṛh}$)
pravát ‘streaming, pouring(?)’ IX.74.7, cf. *práivate* ‘flow, hurry’ (\sqrt{pru})

Wackernagel argues that *īṣát* is an adverbial participle from the same root as RV *īṣate* ‘hasten,’ offering the forms above as corroborative evidence for this possibility. It is not his intention to imply that oxytone accent results from adverbial accent shift in every single one of the forms listed. In fact, Wackernagel makes no explicit mention of accent at all. Still, in equating *īṣát*~*īṣate* with pairs like *dravát*~*drávati*, *patayát*~*patáyati*, *pravát*~*práivate*, he encourages an understanding that the apparent accent shift in *īṣát* conforms to a regular pattern of accent shift in adverbial participles. Renou (1936: 36f.) has made a case for analyzing *īṣát* as an *-r/n*-stem rather than as a participle,³¹ which would undercut Wackernagel’s original purpose in compiling

³¹ Wackernagel acknowledges that *īṣát* is surely related to the YAv. forms *īṣarə*, *iṣa* ‘straightaway, likewise.’ In his view *-arə* in the first form is an analogical replacement for *-at* following the example of temporal

the list. Regardless, the list itself has taken on a life of its own and continues to be cited as evidence that *nt*-participles regularly undergo adverbial accent shift.³² As it was never intended to fully address the topic, however, it creates a distorted and incomplete impression of how adverbial participles typically behave.

Some of the purported ‘participles’ in Wackernagel’s list are either of unclear provenance or, like *īśát*, have been shown to come from an altogether different source. Wackernagel credits Oldenberg (1912: 173) for pointing out *pravát* in IX.74.7 as an adverbial participle, but Oldenberg later retracts his own original suggestion that it is derived from the verbal root \sqrt{pru} comparably to *dravát* : \sqrt{dru} .³³ It has long been recognized that *pravát* is better analyzed as some form of the f. stem *pra-vát-* ‘way forward’ (33×, II+) rather than as a participle of \sqrt{pru} . This stem is derived from the preverb *pra* + *-vát*, parallel in formation to *ni-vát-* ‘depth,’ *ud-vát-* ‘height,’ etc.³⁴ Grassmann tentatively takes the endingless case-form *pravát* in IX.74.7 as a nominative, which is the only real option if it is a feminine *t*-stem, barring some kind of secondary ‘shortening’ (as suggested by Oldenberg; see fn. 33). J&B ultimately concur, translating *pravát* ‘(sloping) course’ in an aside clause that describes *dhiyā sámī* in the first half of the *pāda*.

adverbs, e.g. Ilr. *prātár punár múhur*, Gk. ἄφαρ, and perhaps also YAv. *pauruatarə* ‘before.’ But Renou (1936: 36f.) counters that YAv. *iśarə* may be connected with Ved. *īśát* through an *-r/-n-* system with a *-t-* root extension, the possibility of which was laid out by Benveniste (1935: 30). Under this theory, *īśát* would trace back to a root in *-ṛ-t-*, and not to a n. sg. acc. ppl. with adverbial accent shift.

³² Nishimura (2003: 118) cites the list in its entirety without criticism, Gotō (2013: 147) with only minor modifications. See below.

³³ Oldenberg (1912: 173) does not stand by this with great conviction, offering as an alternative the possibility that *pravát* is a “mechanischer Verkürzung” of either *pravātā* or *pravātah*. Later (1914: 121) he suggests that *pravátam* would be a better candidate for such a shortening; it is here that he also rejects taking adverbial *pravát* from *pru*. In his words, “Adverbielles *pravát* zu *pru-* (vgl. *dravát*), worauf ich zu der St. als Möglichkeit hinwies, entfernt sich unnötig von allem übrigen.”

³⁴ See KEWA II 367 and references therein; already Grassmann compares *pravát* with *udvát*, *nivát*, *parāvát*, *arvāvát*. Nussbaum (2017: 261) clarifies that it is a *t*-stem substantivization **proue/o-t-* ‘way forward’ from the *o*-stem adnominal **pro-uo-* ‘(going) forth, forthcoming’ (ON *frár* ‘fast’ OHG *frō* ‘happy’).

- (28) *dhiyá sámī sacate sá īm abhi pravát* (IX.74.7c)
 ‘He keeps company with insight and (ritual) labor
 —that is **the course** (that leads) to him.’

Also on Wackernagel’s list is the hapax *drahyát* ‘firmly, steadfastly(?)’, which is usually taken to derive somehow from the root $\sqrt{dṛh}$ ‘be firm.’ But the details are notoriously problematic. There are finite forms in a present stem *dṛhya-*, but the root is in the zero-grade, for which reason the adverb is sometimes corrected to *dṛhyát*.³⁵ Adverbial *ṭṛpát* occurs in the same pāda as the sole attestation of *drahyát*, and could conceivably have affected the latter’s accent. If *drahyát* really is modelled after an adverb with zero-grade *r* in the root, however, it must be admitted that this makes its root vocalism all the more baffling.

- (29) *ṭṛpát sómam pāhi drahyát indra* (II.11.15b)
 ‘**Steadfastly** drink our soma **to your satisfaction**, Indra.’

Oldenberg (1909a: 195) takes the opposite approach and hypothesizes the existence of a real verbal stem *dráhya-* from which *drahyát* derives, but the full-grade is unusual for a class 4 -ya-present and such a stem is unattested. Schulze (1883:606f.) dismisses the standard connection with $\sqrt{dṛh}$ due to the incorrect root vocalism. He counter-proposes that *drahyát* reflects a class 4 present participle **drṇhynt* from a supposed root **d^hreng^h* ‘drink,’ cf. Got. *drigkan*. The phrase *drahyát pāhi* would thus mean something akin to ‘take a good swig.’ The connection with Got. *drigkan* is untenable, since it must be traced to a root **d^hreng-* in final **g* rather than **g^h*. However, Schulze may be correct in principle if not in the details. *drahyát* could be traced to a different root **d^hrag^h-* ‘drag,’ the source of PDE ‘draught’ which can refer to a quantity of drink

³⁵ So for example by Rix (1985: 218, n.51).

swallowed at one ‘pull,’ or simply an act of drinking.³⁶ Whatever the ultimate explanation may be, it is premature to assume that *drahyát* must involve an ‘adverbial shift of accent,’ when its morphology remains so unclear in other respects. Certainly at this point the form cannot be straightforwardly invoked as evidence of adverbial accent shift in *nt*-participles.

tṛpát 5×, II+ and *dhṛṣát* 8×, VI+ pose a different problem for the notion that Wackernagel’s list evinces regular adverbial accent shift. These forms may indeed be adverbial participles, but as such they are standard fare with respect to accent. *tṛpát* ‘to satiety’ relates to the verbal root $\sqrt{tṛp}$ ‘sate, enjoy,’ which has a nasal present *tṛpṇóti* alongside a class 6 present *tṛmpáti*, whose stem is strengthened by a penultimate nasal. Aside from *tṛpát* itself, which is only used adverbially, there are no further RV or AV participles in the stem *tṛpánt-*.³⁷ Wackernagel-Debrunner take it as a thematic aorist participle, explicitly remarking that, in contrast to *dravát*, it is used adverbially without accent shift.³⁸ *dhṛṣát* ‘boldly’ is analyzed as the participle of a root aorist or present of the root $\sqrt{dhṛṣ}$ ‘be bold,’ which makes a nasal present *dhṛṣṇóti*. It is used as an adverb (7×, VI+) but with the same accent it is also used attributively (3×, V+) with n. sg. *mánas*. Additional case-forms of the same apparent *nt*-stem include an inst. *dhṛṣatā́* ‘with boldness, boldly’ (18×, II+) that is exclusively adverbial, as well as gen. *dhṛṣatás* (2×, I+) and nom. f. *dhṛṣatī́* II.30.8, both of which are used substantively.

tṛpát and *dhṛṣát* are not alone in maintaining the underlying accent of the participial stem. Omitted from Wackernagel’s list are several adverbial *nt*-participles that retain the *non-final* accent of attested participle stems. Barytone *pátat* III.39.3, *tárat* IX.58.1–4, and *bhárat*

³⁶ As in ME [*Pe neddre*] *cumeð to sum welle and drinkeð a draht swo michel þat heo chineð* (c1200, Trin. Coll. Hom. 199). “draught, n.” *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, January 2018. Web. 25 March 2018. Thanks to Michael Weiss for this suggestion.

³⁷ Aorist *átṛpam* in AV 3.13.6 is the only attested finite form from a thematic stem *tṛpá-*. Since the thematic stem is so rare and no other participles in *tṛpánt-* are attested, it is theoretically possible that adv. *tṛpát* is not participial in origin. Even if this is the case, it would only further support the argument in this section that the forms in Wackernagel’s list are not to be taken as evidence of accent shift in *nt*-participles.

³⁸ AiG II/2 163f.

IX.52.1 may be compared with *pátant-*, *tárant-*, and *bhárant-* respectively, as well as attested finite forms from each verbal root.

- (30) *yamā cit átra yamasúḥ asūta*
jihvāyāḥ ágram pátat ā hí ásthāt (III.39.3ab)

‘She, as bearer of twins, bore her twins just here.
In soaring, (she) has mounted the tip of the tongue.’

- (31) *pári dyukṣáh sanádrayih*
bhárat vājam naḥ ándhasā
suvānáḥ arṣa pavítre ā (IX.52.1)

‘Heaven-ruling, gaining wealth, **bringing** a prize to us with your stalk,
being pressed, rush around into the filter.’

- (32) *tárat sá mandī dhāvati*
dhārā sutásya ándhasaḥ
tárat sá mandī dhāvati =2c,3c,4c (IX.58.1)

‘**In crossing**, the invigorating one runs, the stream of the pressed stalk.
—**In crossing**, the invigorating one runs.’

Though *pátat* usually is taken as a participle, it is not universally regarded as an adverb; Geldner supplies an elided n. sg. *mánas* for it to modify, but J&B’s adverbial interpretation is preferable for its simplicity. Lowe (2015: 281) claims that barytone forms like *tárat* and *bhárat* are not participles at all, but rather are “now generally considered to be injunctives.” While there is some support for this view,³⁹ there is by no means the general consensus on the matter that he claims: Wackernagel-Debrunner and Jamison⁴⁰ take both as adverbial participles.

³⁹ Hoffmann (1967: 123) identifies *bhárat* as a 3 sg. injunctive in IX.52.1, which is the interpretation favored by Geldner: “Herumfahrend möge der Himmlische Reichtümer erwerbend, uns durch seinen Trank Gewinn einbringen. Ausgepresst fliesse auf die Seihe!” While Hoffmann views *tárat* as an injunctive elsewhere (e.g. IX.107.15), he is silent regarding the forms that appear in IX.58. He makes no mention of *pátat*. Note that Lowe (2015: 242) also proposes that both *dhṛṣát* and *ṭpát* would be better treated as n. sg. acc. Caland *nt*-adjectives, rather than as participles. His analyzes all of these forms, *tárat* and *bhárat* included, under a global claim that no Vedic participle ever functions adverbially (thereby distinguishing them from all other adnominals in the language). See fn. 50.

⁴⁰ See AiG II/2 164 and Jamison comm. IX.52 & IX.58 (forthcoming).

Oldenberg (1901: 278f.) proposes that *ṛdhat* ‘prosperously’(?) in VI.2.4 is another adverbial *nt*-participle from the underlying oxytone stem *ṛdhánt-* (: *√ṛdh* ‘prosper, accomplish fortunately’).⁴¹ Unlike any other adverbial participle, *ṛdhat* would involve a leftward shift of accent. Oldenberg operates under the theory that adverbial accent shift is ‘contrastive’ and may be realized variously as a rightward shift in barytone stems and as a leftward shift in oxytone stems.⁴² I am persuaded, however, to take *ṛdhat* as a finite verb, following Grassmann, Geldner, J&B, and Lubotsky (1997). See Jamison (comm. VI.2.4) regarding the irregular zero-grade root syllable in place of full-grade **árdhat*, which would be expected of an aorist subjunctive.

(33) *ṛdhat yáh te sudánave*
dhiyā mártah śasámate
ūtī sá bṛhatáh diváh
dviśáh ámhah ná tarati (VI.2.4)

‘The mortal who **will bring** (the sacrifice) **to fulfillment** with his insight and will perform ritual labor for you of good gifts, with the help of lofty heaven he crosses hatreds like narrow straits.’

cf. Oldenberg⁴³: ‘Der Sterbliche, der **mit glücklichem Vollbringen** sich für dich müht, der dringt hindurch...’

Oldenberg admits that *ṛdhat* may be a finite verb, but he dismisses the possibility without compelling criticism in favor of the participial analysis. Outside of a small group of oblique root-nouns, to my knowledge leftward adverbial accent shift has only been proposed to explain two other forms, *didy̐kṣu* ‘with a desire to see’ and *símā* ‘everywhere,’ neither of which has a secure

⁴¹ Renou is another who identifies *ṛdhát* [sic] ‘avec succès’ in VI.2.4 as a participle “à ton avancé,” but I do not understand his thinking. He cites a form whose accent is in accord with the regular ppl. stem *ṛdhánt-* (cf. m. nom. pl. *ṛdhántah* VII.87.7), but *ṛdhat* is the attested form.

⁴² Oldenberg follows Schmidt (1888: 105), who along with Lanman (1880: *passim*) popularizes the idea that adverbial accent involves a contrastive shift; for more on this theory, see chapter §6. Thanks to Stephanie Jamison for pointing me toward this particular reference.

⁴³ Oldenberg (1909a: 370).

analysis. The theoretical cost of analyzing *śdhat* as an adverbial participle is too high to justify, when other options are available.

On the whole, then, the functional conversion of n. sg. acc. *nt*-participles to adverbs does not require overt marking by a shift of accent. This is not news; there have always been those who are careful to treat accent shift in *nt*-participles as a tendency or option rather than a rule. Wackernagel-Debrunner takes both oxytone *ṭṛpát* and barytone *bhárat* to be adverbial participles that show “Beibehaltung des Akzents,” in contrast to *dravát*, where a shift of accent has occurred.⁴⁴ Delbrück (1893: 611) also invokes *dravát* as the primary example of accent shift, contrasting it with explicitly ‘un-shifted’ adverbial *dhṛṣát*. Others, however, seem to expect accent shift to affect adverbial participles as a rule, though perhaps not exceptionlessly. Oldenberg goes so far as to view the “unverschobener Akz.!” of *tárat* as problematic, contending that maintaining the original accent of the participle stem goes contrary to standard practice for adverbial participles.⁴⁵ Rix (1985: 205) observes, “die Akzentverschiebung beim Adverb und natürlich die Ausdrängung des Themavokals beim ‘schwachen’ Stamm des *-nt*-Partizips im Altindischen regulär sind.” He is sufficiently confident in this that he reconstructs a barytone participial **téh₂-jo-nt* for AV *stāyát* ‘secretly’ 4.16.1, 7.108.1, correcting the accent in the reconstruction to reflect an adverbial accent shift.⁴⁶ Rix cites *dhṛṣát*, *ṭṛpát*, *drahyát* and *dravát* as participial precedents, alongside non-participial examples *uttarát* ‘from above’ (: *úttarāt*) and *divā* ‘by day’ (: *divā́*). But three of the four cited participles give no reliable evidence of shifted accent, and the non-participial examples show divergent behaviors.

⁴⁴ AiG II/2 164.

⁴⁵ Oldenberg (1912: 163). I am unsure as to why he does not seem to find *ṭṛpát*, *dhṛṣát*, or *bhárat* similarly problematic.

⁴⁶ Pinault (1989: 86f.) takes *stāyát* from an oxytone participial stem **stāyánt-* (but *stāyant-*, forthcoming²⁰), itself from a hypothetical present **(s)tāyāti*. Lowe (2015:281, fn. 96) points out that the participial analysis of *stāyát* is tenuous at best, since the existence of a corresponding finite verbal stem, let alone an *nt*-participle, is hypothetical for this root. He suggests instead that *stāyát* may be an *nt*-adjective of a Caland system, on the basis of the related RV *u*-stem *stāyú-* ‘thief’ (but see fn. 50).

A similar understanding has persisted even more recently. Nishimura (2003: 118) accepts Wackernagel’s list in its entirety without criticism, still including *pravát* as a participle of \sqrt{pru} . Gotō (2013: 147) cites the same list excluding only *pravát*, and adds *dyu-g-át* ‘going through heaven’ (VIII.97.4) from an aorist stem $*-g^w h_2-nt$.⁴⁷ Nishimura and Gotō make no distinction between the forms in the list whose oxytone accent is entirely as expected (*dhṛṣát*, *trpát*, *dyugát*), those which really do seem to show a shift of accent according to the traditional participial analysis (*dravát*, *patayát*), and those which show additional irregularities beyond the accent (*drahyát*, *īṣát*). The examples are all misleadingly represented as structurally equivalent participles that all feature adverbial accent shift.⁴⁸

It is rarely pointed out that, once we exclude all the forms in Wackernagel’s list whose accent gives no cause for alarm, and also bring the barytone examples into consideration, we are left with just two adverbs—*dravát* and *patayát*—that occur alongside barytone participial stems, and as such provide a solid reason to believe that some n. sg. acc. *nt*-participles may indeed undergo adverbial shift of accent. Given the range of forms that have been ascribed to adverbial accent shift, the process can only be defined in the broadest sense: accent optionally shifts position in adverbially-functioning case-forms. Since it is ultimately descriptive, it can be invoked to explain practically any adverbial form with anomalous accent, no matter how exceptional within its class. As *dravát* and *patayát* fit the only consistently definable criteria,

⁴⁷ Wackernagel-Debrunner explain *dyu-gát* as a *-t*-extension of \sqrt{gam} in the zero grade, with post-RV parallels *adhva-gát* ‘traveller,’ *nava-gát* ‘newly come,’ and *dvi-gat* ‘twice-going’ (AiG II/2 41).

⁴⁸ Nishimura (2003: 118) makes reference to “the adverb type ending with *-át* such as *dravát* ‘flugs’, *trpát* ‘zur Genüge’, *drahyát* ‘fest’, *dhṛṣát* ‘kühn’, *patayát* ‘im Flug’, *pravát* ‘strömend (?)’, *īṣát* ‘annähernd, obenhin, leichthin’ (Wackernagel Kl.Schr. 313f.), which have originated obviously from the present participle with the change of accent position.” In a discussion of adverbial case-forms and adverbs from case-forms, Gotō (2013: 147) says, “There is a group of adv.s produced from the pres. part. n. through accent-shift: *īṣ-át* ‘approximately, a little’, *drav-át* ‘swiftly’, *trp-át* ‘satisfyingly’, *drahy-át* ‘firmly’, *dhṛṣ-át* ‘boldly’, *patay-át* ‘through flight’, and from an aor. stem *dyu-g-át* < $*-g^w h_2-nt$ ‘going through heaven’ VIII 97.4.” It seems that, in listing ‘shifted’ and ‘unshifted’ forms together, Wackernagel (1918) has given a false impression that accent shift has applied to more forms than it was ever his intention to claim.

there is theoretically no reason why they could not be singled out for accent shift among all adverbial *nt*-participles. But this assumes the initial premise that there is such a process, even though there is no outstanding reason why every accentual irregularity in Vedic adverbs should be attributed to the same underlying cause.

Without a greater understanding of its rules or restrictions, we have no tools to evaluate whether adverbial accent shift is plausible in any given scenario. It cannot be proven, and it can only be disproven if it is superseded by a superior analysis on a case-by-case basis. This should be encouraged over attempting to expand the definition of an optional adverbial accent rule to the point of meaninglessness. If another solution presents itself, it should be given serious consideration on the grounds of economy alone. The simple fact seems to be that in many cases no one has yet gone to the trouble of looking for an alternative, because ‘adverbial accent shift’ has always been available as an *ad hoc* solution. I shall begin to challenge that dogmatic thinking with respect to adverbial *nt*-participles by taking a closer look at *dravát*.

2.2 *dravát*

2.2.1 Background

dravát ‘swiftly’ is used seven times throughout the RV, in each case without an obvious alternative to the standard adverbial interpretation. The examples below are representative of the typical context and use of *dravát*, which consistently occurs in ritual invocations to gods and modifies verbs of approaching and/or driving toward an offering of praise or sacrifice.

(34) *váyo índraḥ ca cetathaḥ*
sutánām vājinīvasū
táu á yātam úpa dravát (I.2.5)

‘O Vayu and Indra, you take note of the pressings, you two rich in prizewinning mares.
Drive right here **at speed**.’

- (35) *á nah stómam úpa dravát*
tūyam syenébhiḥ āśúbhiḥ
yātám áśvebhiḥ aśvinā (VIII.5.7)

‘Here to our praise song drive quickly **at speed** with your swift falcons, your horses [O Ásvins]’

Only the use of *dravát* in VI.45.32 is anomalous in this regard, though even there is still used very much within a context of offering and invocation. Most of hymn VI.45 is addressed to Indra, but the last three verses break from this to praise the patron Bṛbu, who is similarly to respond to the hymn with gifts and patronage:

- (36) *yásya vāyóḥ iva dravát*
bhadrá rātīḥ sahasrīnī
sadyáḥ dānāya máṃhate (VI.45.32)

‘(He) whose propitious gift in the thousands, **at a speed** like the wind's, is ready for giving all at once.’

The literature is virtually unanimous⁴⁹ in taking *dravát* as a neuter participle and explaining its accent as the result of adverbial accent shift. Since it forms an accentual minimal pair with a well-attested participial stem *dráv(a)nt-*, it is one of the most frequently-cited examples of adverbial accent shift, not only in participles but in adverbs of any stem type. Lowe (2015: 281ff.) is an exception to this, claiming that, unlike lexical adjectives, no synchronic participle is ever used adverbially. Accordingly, he advocates a non-participial analysis for each of the various *°at/°át* adverbs.⁵⁰ He claims (264f.) that *dravát* is synchronically de-adjectival rather than

⁴⁹ So for example Lanman (1880: 507), Whitney (§1111e, p. 362), MacDonnell (1910: 103), EWA I 755, and AiG II/2 164. Grassmann concurs, but in vv. VII.10.2 and VIII.49.5 analyzes *dravát* as a finite form “fehlerhaft betont” (despite the fact that VIII.49.5a is identical to VIII.5.7a, where he does analyze *dravát* as an adverb).

⁵⁰ His solution for most is that they originate as Caland *nt*-adjectives. However, it has been pointed out to me by Alan Nussbaum that there is no practical difference between participles and *nt*-adjectives morphologically, and that they may well ultimately reflect the same ancient formation. Many of the so-called Caland roots are closely associated with (or even indistinguishable from) a verbal root. Rau (2009:176) uses *dhṛśánt-* to demonstrate that *nt*-stem adjectives in IE languages including Iir. “often pair with roots that have well-attested primary verbal forms, and in a few instances are unambiguously identical with present or aorist participles.” Though a synchronic

de-verbal, because its basis *dráv(a)nt-* functions “in most of its occurrences” as a lexicalized adjective meaning ‘swift, quick’ rather than literally ‘running.’ However, of the five times that the barytone adnominal stem *drávant-* is used in the Ṛgveda, even Lowe is forced to admit that it is preferable to interpret it as a genuine participle when it takes a dependent phrase:

- (37) *yám sīm ánu pravátā iva drávantam*
vísvaḥ pūruḥ mádati hársamāṇaḥ (IV.38.3ab)

‘The one whom every Pūru applauds in excitement **as he runs as if down an easy slope**’

- (38) *dúdheḥ yuktásya drávataḥ sahá ánasā*
ṛcchānti smā nispádaḥ mudgalānīm (X.102.6cd)

‘but the droppings of the frenzied bull, yoked and **running with the cart**, kept hitting Mudgalānī.’

In the three remaining instances it is by no means clear that his ‘lexicalized adjective’ interpretation is preferable to taking *drávant-* as an ordinary participle functioning metaphorically, and still synchronically within the verbal paradigm of \sqrt{dru} . It is consistently taken this way by Jamison (comm. ad loc.), who note that *drávataḥ* in IV.40.3a looks back to a sequence of adjectives *dravó dravaráh* in IV.40.2c, which are formed from the same verbal root. *drávataḥ* is also paralleled by a metrically identical participle *dhrajataḥ* (\sqrt{dhraj}) in 3c.

- (39) *utá sma asya drávataḥ turāṇyatáh*
parṇám ná véḥ ánu vāti pragardhínah
śyenásya iva dhrájataḥ aṅkasám pári
dadhikrávṇaḥ sahá ūrjā táritrataḥ (IV.40.3)

‘And (the wind) fans up his “feathers” [=mane], like the feathers of a bird in greedy pursuit, **while he runs** and rushes headlong, while he swoops like a falcon around the curving (racecourse), while he keeps advancing with his vigor—Dadhikravan.’

distinction may exist where no diachronic one did, it would be extremely difficult to justify theoretically why Caland *nt*-adjectives can produce n. sg. acc. adverbs but *nt*-participles cannot. It is perhaps a distinction not worth making.

- (40) *sá nah sudánuh mṛṛáyantī devī*
prāti drávantī suvitāya gamyāḥ (V.41.18cd)

‘That gracious goddess of good drops/gifts should come towards us **at a run**, for our welfare.’

- (41) *mánaḥ ná yéṣu hávaneṣu tigmám*
vípah śácyā vanuthaḥ drávantā (X.61.3ab)

‘(Tūrvayāṇa)—to whose invocations you two [=Aśvins] **run** and win inspired words, (produced) by his skill, that are like sharp thinking’

Lowe is mainly concerned with the functional properties of Ṛgvedic participles in general rather than the accent of these particular forms, and in several cases he is content to leave the philological particulars unsolved. In the case of *dravánt-*, Lowe’s argument ultimately falls back on a troubling degree of circularity: “Its adjectival status is clear also from its use in the a.sg.nt. as an adverb, which is not found with synchronic participles” (p. 264). At any event, he agrees with the traditional view that *dravát* is derived from *drávant-*. Even though he questions the synchronic analysis of the latter, he tacitly continues to assume that the accentual disparity between the adverb and the *nt*-stem is brought about by adverbial accent shift. On the whole I remain skeptical of Lowe’s conclusions, but even if not fully convincing in the particulars, his work opens the door to questioning the morphological make-up of this particular °*át* adverb.

dravát cannot be taken as an *nt*-participle without some kind of further justification, but to this point alternatives have not been explored, because it is universally assumed, *prima facie*, that adverbial accent shift is a standard process in Vedic. However, given the formal ambiguity of Vedic forms in final °*at* or °*át*, for which there are abundant diachronic sources, it is certainly possible—and I argue preferable—to analyze *dravát* as something other than a participle in the first place.

2.2.2 *dravát* as an *-(E)t-stem abstract

Oxytone *dhṛṣát*, *trpát*, and barytone *bhárat*, *tárat*, *pátat* can easily be analyzed as n. sg. acc. *nt*-participles at face value. Any neuter singular accusative adnominal in the language can be used adverbially,⁵¹ and they are formally consistent with the n. acc. sg. of *nt*-participles from these verbal roots, even with respect to accent. Instead of dismissing it as secondary, we could opt to take the accentual disparity between *dravát* and *drávant*- seriously, as formal evidence that the adverb does not originate as a participle at all—like *pravát*, probably *ṛdhat* and *īṣát*, and perhaps others. A non-participial source for *dravát* would render the contrasting accent of the adnominal stem *dráv(a)nt*- irrelevant. Depending on the analysis, there may be no reason even to consider adverbial accent shift as part of the equation.

A thematic adjective *dravá*- ‘running’ (:√*dru*), which was briefly mentioned above in conjunction with *drávatas* (§39), provides a starting point for an alternative analysis of *dravát*. *dravá*- is found only in IV.40.2 in the RV, though it later becomes common.

(42) *sátvā bhariṣáh gaviṣáh duvanyasát*
*śravasyát iṣáh uṣásah turanyasát*⁵²
*satyáh **draváh dravaráh** patamgaráh*
dadhikrāvā iṣam úrjam svàr janat (IV.40.2)

‘A consummate warrior seeking plunder, seeking cattle, he will seek fame in a rush to the distance, in a headlong rush to the refreshments of Dawn.

The real thing—**running, running faster**, flying—

Dadhikravan gives birth to refreshment, nourishment, and the sun.’

dravá- is an adnominal of the *R(E)-ó*- “τομός” type, which has uniformly oxytone outcomes in

Vedic, e.g. *sāhá*- ‘superior’ : √*sah*, *svāná*- ‘noisy’ : √*svan*, *tośá*- ‘hastening’ : √*tuś*. *R(E)-ó*-

⁵¹ *pace* Lowe (2015: 281), who treats adnominal participles as the sole exception to this generalization.

⁵² While it is standard to analyze *turanyasát*, a hapax, as a compound with second member *-sád-*, Jamison (comm. IV.40.2) however takes it as an n. sg. participle, innovated on the model of *-asāná-* (pseudo-)participles: *mandāná-* : *mandasāná-* :: *turanyánt-* : **turanyasánt-*. If this is correct, I cannot help but notice that there is nothing unusual about the participle’s accent, which Jamison regards as the neuter in adverbial usage.

adnominals, along with agentives and patientives, were among the admissible bases for further derivatives in **(E)t-* in the proto-language, among which are endocentric substantive adjectives, such as the following:⁵³

(43) *t*-STEM DERIVATIVES FROM THEMATIC BASES

Hitt. *ḫappina-* ‘rich’ → *ḫappina-tt-* ‘wealth’

PIE **steipo-* ‘rigid’ (Gmc. **steifa-* > OE *stīf* ‘stiff’) → L. *stīpes, stīpit-* ‘stick’

Gk. ἀργός ‘bright’ → ἀργής, ἀργέτ- ‘shining’

Gk. γυμνός ‘unclothed’ → γυμνής, γυμνήτ- ‘unclothed (one)’, i.e. ‘light-armed soldier’

PIE **pro-uo-* ‘(going) forth, forthcoming’ → *proue/o-t-* > Ved. *pravát-* ‘way forward’

PIE **sro/euó-* ‘flowing’ (Gk. ῥόος ‘stream,’ ῥοή < **sroué-h₂*)

→ **sro/euét-* ‘fluidity’ > Vedic *sravát-* ‘stream’

The same derivational process may have produced *dravát-* ‘running,’ a neuter ‘weak adjective’ *t*-stem from the thematic verbal adjective *dravá-*. This would make neuter *dravát* and feminine *sravát* morphologically identical, excepting only their different gender assignments. *dravát-* must be neuter under this analysis so that its endingless form *dravát*, which is the only form of the stem that we see, can be interpreted in context as the n. acc. sg. in adverbial use.

Incidentally, a homophonous *dravát-* also appears as the first member of the compounds *dravát-pani-* ‘having swift hooved (horses)’ I.3.1; VIII.5.35, *dravát-aśva-* ‘drawn by swift horses’ IV.43.2, and *dravác-cakra-* ‘with running wheels’ VIII.34.18. This *dravát-* may be compared with the *t*-stem first members in the *vidád-vasu-* type of verbal governing compounds, the origin of which is disputed. These compound members have often been identified as participles in **-nt-* which, for unclear reasons, have generalized accent on the second syllable

⁵³ Nussbaum (2017: 261).

regardless of its location in the corresponding participle.⁵⁴ But Ilr. *-at-* is ambiguous, and may equally trace back to **(E)t-*. If first-members of verbal governing compounds in *-át-* are taken to be participles, their accent requires further explanation, since it contrasts with other bahuvrihis that have *nt*-adjectives as first members.⁵⁵ Ordinarily, these retain the accent of the simplex *nt*-stem, e.g. *brhánt-* : *brhát-ketu-* ‘with lofty sign’ but *riúsant-* ‘shining’ : *riúsat-pásu-* ‘with shining cattle,’ *pr̥śant-* : *pr̥śad-aśva-* ‘with speckled horse,’ *járant-* ‘old’ : *járat-kar̥ṇa-* ‘with an old donkey’ (personal name). Building on Schindler’s hypothesis that all verbal governing compounds originate as bahuvrihis with first-member abstracts, Pinault (ftcm., 5f.) suggests that first members in *-át* originated not as participles but rather as abstracts in **(É)t-* derived from thematic stems.⁵⁶ The accent on the final syllable of the first member is consistent with an origin in this type. Since the **(E)t-* stem abstract is closely related to a thematic verbal stem, it can be reanalyzed as de-verbal, and its ‘accent shift’ is regarded as a by-product of compound formation. From there, homophonous de-verbal constructions in *-at*, notably injunctives and *nt*-participles, can be productively incorporated as first members of the same compound type, particularly since many of the latter (e.g. *brhánt-*, *dhṛśánt-*) were already accented on the second syllable.

It is unclear what implications this has for adverbial *dravát*. On the one hand it is possible that *dravát-aśva-*, for example, reflects a retention of an old compound type with an **(E)t-* abstract first member, originally meaning *‘whose horses have running.’ If that is the case, the **(E)t-* stem analysis of the compound member *dravát-* would correspond exactly with the simplex

⁵⁴ See AiG II/1 §113 and §120. Wackernagel does point out the possibility that adverbial *dravát* comes into play with compounds in first-member *dravát-*, without going into specifics. A list of cases where the attested participle and the first compound member do not agree in accent can also be found in Whitney (§1299b, p. 505).

⁵⁵ So noted by Pinault (forthcoming, 5f.), who criticizes previous accounts for failing to offer such an explanation, not unreasonably.

⁵⁶ Weiss (2018: 354f.) compares the Western Indo-European tribal name Veneti **yenḗt-* with Plr. **yanát-* in YAv. *vanaṭ.pəšana-* ‘winning battles’ and in the Iranian name Βαναδάσπος **yanát-aspa-* ‘winning horses’ as potential support for the *-et-* stem hypothesis proposed by Pinault.

adverbial *dravát*, neatly allowing us to solve two accentual oddities at the same time. But of course it *dravát-* in compounds could simply be a participle, whose shifted accent follows the synchronically productive pattern for this type of compound. An **(E)t*-stem origin does not, of course, rule out the possibility that *dravát* was synchronically de-verbal. Nussbaum (2017: 261f.) has previously noted how the association between an **(E)t*-stem derivative such as **sreúé-t-* (> Ved. *sravát*) and a present verbal stem, in this case **sréuo/e-* (> *srávati*), could easily lead to a synchronic reanalysis that the *t*-stem derives from the verb. In Vedic, just as f. *sravát-* could be reanalyzed as a derivative of *srávati*, similarly a neuter *t*-stem *dravát* could be synchronically derived from *drávati*, regardless of its actual point of origin. Its resemblance to the *nt*-participle in all but accent could easily lead to a partial collapse of the two paradigms, producing the synchronic illusion of accent shift.⁵⁷

Though it takes care of the accent, an **(E)t*-stem analysis of adverbial *dravát* has a few lingering issues. First, it is less than ideal that the sole form available for direct morphological comparison, f. *sravát*, differs in gender assignment. We could eliminate the necessity to analyze *dravát* as a neuter if, instead of an accusative singular in adverbial usage, we take it instead to be an endingless locative, literally ‘in (the) running, at a run.’ This would be somewhat atypical of endingless locatives, which are normally restricted to stems in final *i*, *u*, nasals, liquids, and *s*.⁵⁸ However, there is at least one other potential endingless locative in stem-final *t*, and it too is an adverb: Skt. *par-út* ‘last year’ (Pāṇ.+) is thought to reflect an endingless locative of the root-noun **uēt-* ‘year.’⁵⁹ But in any case, there is no theoretical problem with a substantivized **(E)t*-

⁵⁷ This, in turn, paves the way for the innovation of new formations like *patayát* ‘in flight,’ which are difficult to explain as anything other than de-verbal (see §2.3).

⁵⁸ Brugmann *Grdr*² II/2 174ff.

⁵⁹ Cf. Gk. *πέρυσσι* (Dor. *πέρυσσι*), Arm. *heru*, OIc. (*i*)*fford* in the regular *-i* locative, which is directly reflected by Hitt. *uitti*. See EWA II 94f. and Nussbaum (1986: 83, fn. 107), who mentions some problematic aspects of this form and its reconstruction, not the least of which is its unexpected accent.

stem abstract being neuter rather than feminine. The gender disparity does not aid our argument, but neither does it make for strong counter-evidence.

It must also be noted that the thematic adjective stem *dravá-* is attested only once in the RV, in a verse that is riddled with wordplay innovations. Two other hapaxes occur in the same pāda: one of these, *dravará-*, is transparently built from *dravá-* itself. The other, *patamgará-*, is a similar ‘comparative’ extension of an established stem *patam-gá-*, and influenced by the other word-forms in the verse.⁶⁰ Since the entire **(E)t-* stem theory rests on the existence of an old thematic stem *dravá-*, any doubt about the reliability of the forms in this verse is potential cause for concern. *dravá-* is used with greater frequency after the RV, but this does little to bolster claims of its antiquity. There is corroborating evidence outside of Vedic, however, in the river name Drau (Slov., Croat.), a tributary of the Danube known for its rapid current. Called Δράβος by Strabo (*Geo.* VII.5.2) and *Dravus* by Pliny (*Nat.* III.28), the name traces to a thematic stem **droṷ-o-*.⁶¹ Ved. *dravá-* itself is of straightforward composition, and especially in light of this evidence it is not unreasonable to project it to a very early stage.

In sum, the ambiguity of terminal °át in Vedic enables us to completely avoid the problem of accentual disparity between ppl. *drávant-* and adv. *dravát*. There need not be any derivational relationship between the two forms, although their superficial resemblance most likely encouraged a synchronic association and a (historically inaccurate) de-verbal reanalysis of the adverb.

⁶⁰ See Jamison (comm. IV.40.2).

⁶¹ Greule (2014: 102) attributes the development from **Drovos* to **Dravos* to the influence of a single language, perhaps Pannonian. The connection between Ved. \sqrt{drav} and the river name is mentioned also in LIV 129 and EWA I 756.

2.3 Analogical extension to *patayát*

In contrast to *dravát*, adverbial *patayát* (: √*pat* ‘fly’) is inescapably de-verbal because it contains the causative suffix *-áya-*. The form appears only once, in a verse whose interpretation is somewhat ambiguous:

- (44) *ā́ īm ā́śúm ā́śáve bhara*
yajñáśríyam ṛmā́danam
patayát mandayátsakham (I.4.7)

‘Bring the swift to the swift—(bring soma), the glory of the sacrifice, causing exhilaration to men, exhilarating our comrade [=Indra] **in its flight.**’

patayát is frequently analyzed not as a participle, but rather as the first element of a truncated compound *patayát-(sakha-)* ‘setting a companion a-flight.’⁶² Under this view, the second member of this compound is supplied from *mandayát-sakham* ‘exhilarating a companion,’ the compound which directly follows the sole appearance of *patayát(-)*. Compare Geldner’s translation: ‘Traget ihn auf, für den raschen Indra den raschen Soma, der das Opfer verschönt, den männerberauschenden, *eiligst den Freudenergötzer!*’ Many of the RV compounds with first members in *-át*, discussed in the previous section, are formed from causative verbal stems. Among these, the accent of *patayát-* would be unexceptional. There are drawbacks to this analysis, however. It is true that if several coordinated compounds share a compound member, that member may only be expressed once, but *patayát-mandayát-sakham* has no exact parallels. Wackernagel attempts to provide corroborating examples, but each has an overt conjunction to signal coordination:

⁶² It is so taken by Grassmann, Wackernagel-Debrunner (AiG II/1 318), Renou (1952: 397) and Pinault (forthcoming). Similarly by Lowe (2015: 283), though he also offers several possible alternatives, “neither of which is entirely satisfactory.” One of his suggestions is to take *patayát* as a nonce metrical replacement m. sg. acc. *patáyantam*.

(45) OVERTLY COORDINATED COMPOUNDS⁶³

mitrótá médhhyātithim (RV I.36.17)
‘den Mitrātithi und den Medhyātithi’

na dṛṣṭa-pūrvo na ca śrutaḥ (Mbh. 2.49.22b)
‘weder zuvor gesehen noch gehört’

brahmārambhe ‘*vasāne ca* (M. 2.71)
‘beim Anfang und beim Ende des Brahman’

Moreover, there is no precedent for *soma* to be the subject of transitive \sqrt{pat} ‘make fly,’ nor is *patāya-* the appropriate stem for its causative meaning in the context of this compound. The stem *pātāya-* supplies the causative meaning ‘make fly,’ whereas *patāya-* is a simple intransitive ‘fly.’⁶⁴ Thus, the expected form of a compound with the sense ‘causing a companion to fly’ would be *pātayāt-sakham**. Primarily on account of this, Oldenberg (1909a: 4) and Jamison (comm. ad loc.) recommend taking *patayāt* as a n. sg. acc. participle meaning ‘in flight.’⁶⁵ Of course, its accent contrasts with that of the regular participle stem *patāyant-*, and it is for this reason that Oldenberg and others suggest that *patayāt* is parallel to *dravāt* in showing ‘adverbial accent shift.’

The fact that adverbial *patayāt* has a synchronic parallel in *dravāt* allows for a slight revision of this scenario. Regardless of whether or not it is diachronically an **(E)t-*stem abstract, on the surface *dravāt* remains formally indistinguishable from the neuter singular accusative of

⁶³ AiG II/1 30f.

⁶⁴ According to Jamison (1983: 61, fn. 32), “This is the usual pattern of vocalism in the *-āya-*formations of CaC roots, where full grade usually corresponds to intrans. value and extended grade to trans. value.” The compounds *yāvayat-sakhāḥ* ‘companion who wards off’ (\sqrt{yu}) in X.26.5 and *drāvayāt-sakham* ‘causing a companion to run’ (\sqrt{dru}) in X.39.10 are built to roots of a different shape, but nevertheless they are interesting comparanda showing the lengthened grade predicted for a causative.

⁶⁵ Following Oldenberg (1909a: 4). A literary argument can also be appealed to against the hypocoristic compound theory. Jesse Lundquist notes the presence of a compound chiasmus in the final elements of the b and c pādas, which both end with compounds of the root \sqrt{mad} ‘exhilarate’ in mutually inverse order, i.e. *ṇmādanam* ‘exhilarating men’/*mandayātsakham* ‘exhilarating a companion’ (for which see Jamison, comm. ad loc.). The intervening presence of an extraneous element to form a syntactic unit with the second compound would interfere with the poetic symmetry.

the participle *drávant-*, with displaced accent. Adverbial *dravát* ‘at a run’ next to a finite present *drávati*, ppl. *drávant-* could give rise to the innovation of *patayát* ‘in flight’ from *patáyati*, ppl. *patáyant-* through straightforward analogy. This is encouraged by the semantic similarity between the two verbs of motion, which are both regularly used in a figurative sense to indicate haste.

- (46) ppl. *drávant-* : *dravát* III+ ‘on the run’ :: ppl. *patáyant-* : ***patayát*** I.4.7 ‘in flight’
 (pres. *drávati*⁶⁶) (pres. *patáyati*)

Even if *patayát* has genuinely been re-modeled after a synchronically de-verbal *dravát*, this ‘accent shift’ remains an isolated four-part analogy, and not a suprasegmental process that productively extends to adverbs in general. The distinction merits a degree of explicit attention that it has not thus far received in the literature, which remains agnostic regarding the particulars of how ‘adverbial accent shift,’ if it really exists, would apply. The analogical scenario under (§46) does allow for a synchronic perception that a change of accent in the model pair *drávant-* : *dravát* reflects a change in status from adnominal to adverb. It also allows that the accent of *patayát* was relocated from its base position in the stem *patáyant-*, on the basis of this perception. This could indeed be considered a case of ‘adverbial accent shift.’ But the shift in *patayát* is in all likelihood motivated by its similarity to an identifiable analogical model, and not by membership within some abstract functional class that encompasses all adverbs throughout the language. This is quite different, then, from proposing that the language has a productive or even semi-productive morphological process of accent shift that optionally applies during the derivation of adverbs as a unitary class. There is no evidence that the analogical shift observed

⁶⁶ It is not certain that *patayát* is formed from the n. sg. acc. participle *patáyat*, as opposed to being created directly from the finite verb stem. The four-part analogy *drávati* : *dravát* :: *patáyati* : *x* could produce *patayát* just as well as *drávant-* : *dravát* :: *patáyant-* : *x*.

here from root to suffix—which does not extend beyond *patayát*, even to other adverbial participles—is connected with apparent accent shift in adverbs like *dakṣiṇé* or *dívā* of different stem types and morphological make-ups. There are equally idiosyncratic explanations, I suspect, for their respective accents.

2.4 Conclusion

Adverbial *dravát* and *patayát* have been taken as participles with a secondary accent shift, because it has been assumed that any adverbially-used case-form is eligible for this process. It is possible to eliminate the need for adverbial accent shift in the first place if we take the accent of *dravát* seriously, and trace the adverb to a non-participial source for which oxytone accent is the regular outcome. Analyzing *dravát* as an **(E)t*-stem is one way to achieve this, though in this case both *dravát* and *patayát* are probably best analyzed as adverbial participles. N. sg. acc. *drávat* could well become adv. *dravát* under the analogical influence of *-vát* adverbs, which occur in the same contexts and which it superficially resembles due to the phonological shape of its stem. *dravát* < *drávant-* in turn provides a model on which to base the shift observed in *patayát* ‘in flight’ < *patáyant-*, which is difficult to explain as anything other than de-verbal.

I would not dispute that the analogical scenario described above could still be termed ‘adverbial accent shift,’ inasmuch as the adverbial character of *dravát* and *patayát* is reflected in a change of accent from its base position in the adnominal stem for each of these. There is no need, however, to associate these forms with any other instance of descriptive adverbial accent shift in the language, either synchronically or diachronically. Letting go of the idea that these cases are all connected frees us to consider individualized explanations that we might otherwise dismiss, and which are ultimately more satisfying.

CHAPTER 3

‘THEMATIC’ ADVERBS IN PRODUCTIVE SUFFIXES

Thus far in chapters §1–2, we have dealt with adverbs in recognizable derivational suffixes that appear to draw accent in an exceptional way. With equative *-vát* adverbs in chapter §1, we saw the label of ‘adverbial accent shift’ applied to what is actually an accented adverbial suffix, due to two conspiring factors:

- (a) the reason for its accent-displacement is synchronically opaque, and
- (b) aside from the accent, the forms superficially resemble a common formation in the language that can be readily derived using productive morphological material.

Those same factors are at play with two additional adverb types covered in the present chapter.

Adverbs in *-ayǎ́* and adverbs in *-tarám* have both been explained as thematic case-forms with an irregular shift of accent to the case ending to mark them for adverbial use. There are indeed a number of adjectival thematic stems that produce adverbial forms with apparently ‘shifted’ accent, and these will be discussed in chapter §5. Adverbs in *-ayǎ́* and *-tarám* do not belong in that discussion, because they are actually derived via suffixation. Accented suffixes produce the illusion of accent shift due to their homophony with ordinary adjectival forms, but in most cases corresponding thematic stems are not even attested.

Section §3.1 covers adverbs in *°ayǎ́* and *°uyǎ́*. The former were once regarded as feminine *-áyā* instrumentals with adverbial accent shift, which perhaps provided the model for adverbs in *-u-yǎ́* from *u*-stems. It is now generally conceded, however, that both types are formed in an accented suffix *-yǎ́*, which is not added exclusively to thematic stems. Several competing theories exist to explain the origin of adverbial *-yǎ́*, none of which involve adverbial accent shift.

Section §3.2 covers comparatives of adverbial preverbs in the suffix *-tarám/-tarám̄*, which have been analyzed as neuter accusatives of (ordinarily bartyone) comparative *-tara-* stems. In reality, accented *-tarám̄* is a productive suffix that is added directly to preverbs. The original reason for its inherent accent invites further investigation, but in the broader context of ‘adverbial accent shift’ the situation appears to be analogous to that of *-vát* in chapter §1. Even those who analyze *-tarám̄* as a productive suffix retain ‘adverbial accent shift’ as a convenient explanation for the accent of the suffix itself—projecting the process into the distant past—but the claim is a holdover from the earlier de-adjectival theory and is not convincingly justified.

3.1 Adverbs in °*a-yá* and °*uyá*

Adverbs in °*a-yá* are derived from a variety of stem types, including (a) thematic adjectives, (b) nominal consonant stems, and (c) the pronominal stem *kúha*.

(47) °*a-yá* ADVERBS

- a. *ṛtayá* ‘in the right way’ II.11.12 (: *ṛtá-*, adj. ‘proper, right’), cf. YAv. *aṣaiia*
sumnayá ‘in the right way’ X.101.4 (: *su-mná-*, adj. ‘pious’, n. ‘piety’)
adatrayá ‘in a non-gifting/gifted manner’ V.49.3 (: *a-* + *dátra-*, adj. ‘without a gift’⁶⁷)
svapnayá ‘in a dream’ AV+ (: *svápna-*, m. ‘sleep, dream’)
akṣṇayá ‘transversely, wrongly’ ŚB (: *akṣṇā-**)
madhyá ‘in the middle (of)’ 4×, II+ (: *mádhya-*, adj./n. ‘middle’), < *madhyayá*(?)
ubhayá ‘in both ways, on both sides’ X.108.6 (: *ubháya-*, adj. ‘both’), < *ubhayayá*(?)
- b. *kṣmayá* 5×, V+, *jmayá* VII.39.3 ‘on the earth’ (: *kṣám-*, f. ‘earth’)
āsayá ‘by mouth’⁶⁸ I.20.1, I.127.8 (: *ās-*, n. ‘face, mouth’)
naktayá ‘by night’ IV.11.1 (: **nakt-* ‘night’)
- c. *kuhayá* ‘where?’ VIII.24.30 (: *kúha*, prn. ‘where?’)

⁶⁷ Cf. *su-dátra-* ‘giving well’ 3×, VII.

⁶⁸ J&B and Geldner translate *āsayá* ‘by mouth,’ whereas Wackernagel (AiG III 317) and Mayrhofer (EWA I 182) interpret the same word as ‘before the face, in front of.’ cf. *āsá* ‘by mouth, in the face, at present’ (21×, II+) and *āsás* ‘from the mouth’ (VII.99.7).

Historically, lexical adverbs in °*a-yá* were routinely identified as instrumentals marked for adverbial use by a shift of accent to the final syllable, due to their superficial resemblance to feminine *ā*-stem instrumentals in *-áyā*. It has been acknowledged for some time that this view of °*ayá* adverbs is highly suspect, in part because there is also a group of lexical adverbs in °*u-yá* of equal antiquity and greater frequency. Forms in °*u-yá* appear to be the same construction as adverbs in °*a-yá*, yet they cannot be straightforwardly derived from *u*-stems by a shift of accent.

(48) °*u-yá* ADVERBS

sādhuyá ‘straightaway’ 6×, V+ (: *sādhú-*, adj. ‘straight’, inst. *-únā*)
raghuyá ‘swiftly’ II.28.4 (: *raghú-*, adj. ‘fast’)
dhṛṣṇuyá ‘boldly’ 15×, IV+ (: *dhṛṣṇú-*, adj. ‘bold’, inst. *-únā*)
āsuyá ‘quickly’ IV.4.2, VI.46.14 (: *āsú-*, adj. ‘fast’; = YAv. *āsuiā*)
anuṣṭhuyá ‘immediately’ IV.4.14 (: *anuṣṭhú* ‘following’ I.95.3)
mithuyá ‘falsely’ VII.104.13 (cf. *míthū*, adv. ‘falsely’ I.162.20, VI.18.8)
amuyá ‘in that way’ 7×, IV+ (: *amu-*, prn. ‘that’)

3.1.1 Background

There is an early consensus among Lanman (1880: 358), Grassmann, Whitney (1889: 362f.), and others⁶⁹ that adverbs of the °*ayá* type originate as feminine instrumentals, which have undergone a change in the location of accent upon their conversion to adverbs. Instrumentals in *-áyā* may be used adverbially with ordinary accent, as is evidenced by *pāpáyā* ‘badly, so bad’ 5× (: *pāpá-* ‘bad’), *vāmáyā* ‘beautifully, well’ VIII.9.7 (: *vāmá-* ‘lovely’), AV *bhadráyā* (: *bhadrá-* ‘good’). Nevertheless, Lanman claims that “[t]he adverbial character of *adatrayá* (from *adatrá-*) explains the displacement of the accent; so *naktayá*...and *svapnayá*...and perhaps *ṛtayá*.” Derived feminine *ā*-stems are freely hypothesized as the bases of many of the adverbs under (§47), especially the de-nominal adverbs, in order to suit the theory. Grassmann’s *Wörterbuch*, for

⁶⁹ The forms are identified as f. instrumentals as early as Bopp (1824: 299), but he makes no comment regarding the accent. Thomson (1891: 28ff.), Delbrück (1893: 585), MacDonnell (VS 264), and more recently Gotō (2003: 148) repeat the analysis, either in part or whole.

example, lists feminine \bar{a} -stems $a\text{-datr}\bar{a}\text{-}^*$, $k\check{s}m\acute{a}\text{-}^*$, $\bar{a}s\acute{a}\text{-}^*$, and $nakt\acute{a}\text{-}^*$ solely in order to account for $adatr\acute{a}y\acute{a}$, $k\check{s}m\acute{a}y\acute{a}$, $\bar{a}s\acute{a}y\acute{a}$, and $nakt\acute{a}y\acute{a}$ as feminine instrumentals in $-ay\bar{a}$. There is no independent evidence that any such stems actually existed, however. The proposition of an underlying feminine nominal base is least convincing of all in the case of $adatr\acute{a}y\acute{a}$, which is in all likelihood morphologically unrelated to the other $-y\acute{a}$ adverbs listed under (§47–48). It is extremely awkward to interpret $adatr\acute{a}y\acute{a}$, which is glossed ‘in a non-gifting/gifted manner’ in the list above, as a standard $^{\circ}ay\bar{a}$ adverb.⁷⁰ Jamison (comm. V.49.3) theorizes that $adatr\acute{a}y\acute{a}$ does not belong to this group at all, but is instead a root-noun compound with second member $\sqrt{y\bar{a}}$ ‘travel, drive,’ hence meaning ‘traveling to those without gifts.’ The accent is correct for such a compound.⁷¹

(49) *adatr\acute{a}y\acute{a} dayate v\acute{a}ry\bar{a}\check{n}i*
p\bar{u}\check{s}\bar{a} bh\acute{a}ga\check{h} \acute{a}diti\check{h} v\acute{a}sto usr\acute{a}\check{h} (V.49.3ab)

‘Travelling to those lacking gifts, (each god) distributes valuables—Pūṣan, Bhaga, Aditi—at the dawning of the ruddy (Dawn).’

Analysis of the adverbs under (§47a) that derive from thematic adjectives is complicated by the availability of two competing feminine instrumental endings: $-\bar{a}$ and $-ay\bar{a}$. Thomson (1891: 29) is mostly alone in suggesting that $sumn\acute{a}y\acute{a}$ derives from the adjectival compound $sumn\acute{a}\text{-}$, with accent shift. It is almost universally taken instead as a homophonous instrumental of a feminine stem $sumn\acute{a}y\bar{a}\text{-}^*$ (cf. $sumn\check{a}y\bar{u}\text{-}$, $sumn\check{a}y\acute{a}nt\text{-}$), an alternative that even Thomson himself mentions without criticism. Grassmann and Lanman are less certain regarding $\check{r}t\acute{a}y\acute{a}$, which they suggest might be either a feminine $-ay\bar{a}$ instrumental of the thematic adjective stem

⁷⁰ Grassmann translates $adatr\acute{a}y\acute{a}$ as ‘ohne Geschenk empfangen zu haben,’ and Monier-Williams suggests ‘not through a present.’ Geldner’s translation of the first pāda in V.49.3 reads, “Ohne ein Gegengeschenk zu erlangen teilen Pusan, Bhaga, Aditi am Anbruch des Morgens die wünschenswerten Gaben aus.”

⁷¹ Similarly, Grassmann analyzes $jmay\acute{a}$ in VII.39.3 as m. nom. pl. compound $jma\text{-}y\acute{a}(h)$: ‘going ($\sqrt{y\bar{a}}$) on the earth ($jman\text{-}$),’ but this is discounted in later literature. See AiG III 76, where it is taken to be of comparable construction to other adverbs in the adverbial suffix $-y\acute{a}$.

ṛtá-, or a homophonous *-ā* instrumental built to a feminine stem *ṛtayā́-**. The same ambiguity exists with *madhyā́* (: *mádhyā-*) and *ubhayā́* (: *ubháya-*). Neither stem makes a non-adverbial feminine instrumental in the RV, but we would expect to find *ubháyaṃ* and *mádhyāṃ* rather than *ubháyā** and *mádhyā**. Bartholomae (1889: 21, fn. 4) analyzes *ubhayā́* as a haplologized form of original accent-shifted *ubhayayā́,** and Wackernagel-Debrunner propose the same for *madhyā́* from *madhyayā́**.⁷² If *madhyā́* and *ubhayā́* result from haplology,⁷³ they may be understood as further examples of the feminine instrumental *°ayā́* type with adverbial accent. However, it is equally possible to take the transmitted forms at face value. Lanman (1880: 358) argues that they are homophonous instrumentals in f. inst. sg. *-ā* with accent shift, comparing them with *dakṣiṇā́* ‘on the right’ (: *dákṣiṇa-*), *samanā́* ‘together’ (: *sámāna-*), etc. Lanman’s analysis has the benefit of simplicity, and both *madhyā́* and *ubhayā́* do align well semantically with the numerous ‘accent-shifted’ adverbs in *-ā́* from thematic stems, which universally have directional/locative semantics (see §5.3.2). But locative semantics are equally appropriate to *(a)yā́* adverbs, if Bartholomae (below) is correct about their origin. I lean toward taking *ṛtayā́* from an adjective stem *ṛtá-*, and both *madhyā́* and *ubhayā́* as haplologized forms also in original *-ayā́*.

When it comes to the *-u-yā́* adverbs, the situation is generally more straightforward. Leaving aside the adverbs in this list, no *u*-stems make irregular instrumentals in *-u-y-ā́*, regardless of accent or usage. It is clear that the derivation of these adverbs involves more than a simple shift of accent. Nevertheless, doubtless due to their close association with *°ayā́* adverbs, Whitney and Lanman regard adverbs in *°uyā́* as instrumentals with accent shift—in spite of the problematic interposition of *-y-* before the ending. In the words of Whitney, adverbially used *u-*

⁷² AiG III 76.

⁷³ So by Grassmann, MacDonnell (1910: 264), Whitney (§1112e p. 362), Thomson (1891: 27f.), AiG III 76.

stems are distinguished from normal instrumentals “by a *y* insterted before the ending, which is then accented.”⁷⁴ Descriptively this is more or less the case, but it gives an overly complicated and misleading picture of how the forms arise. Lanman (1880: 358) matter-of-factly observes that, “Six oxytone stems in *ú* have instrumentals in *-u-y-á*, with adverbial displacement of accent.”

3.1.2 Alternative analyses

Avestan parallels attest that the *-yá* adverb type is inherited from Indo-Iranian. The Avestan forms observe a similar restriction to *a*- and *u*-stem bases, e.g. *āsuiiā-ca* (= Ved. *āśuyā*), *ašaiia* (= Ved. *ṛtayā*), YAv. *vanhuiia* ‘well’ (cf. Skt. *vasu-*), OAv. *aṅraiiā* ‘maliciously.’ From the inherited distribution, and also from the lack of evidence for feminine *ā*-stems next to any of the stems with corresponding adverbs in *-ayā*, many have rejected the long-standing theory that adverbial *-ayā* originates in the inst. sg. of f. *ā*-stems.⁷⁵ Two main alternatives have been proposed to explain the form and function of ^o*ayā*/^o*uyā* adverbs as a class.

Schmidt (1889: 212ff., fn. 1) sees a probable connection to pronominal *ayā*, which is synchronically both an instrumental pronoun and an adverb meaning ‘in this manner, thus.’ Schmidt explains that *ayā* was originally a genderless instrumental singular demonstrative pronoun (cf. gen./loc. du. *ayós*) that only later specialized as a feminine case-form. In its adverbial role, it provided the model on which the pronominal adverb *amuyā* ‘in that way’ (: *amú-* ‘that’) was initially created. Together, these forms then provided models for de-adjectival adverbs in ^o*a-yā* from *a*-stems and ^o*u-yā* from *u*-stems.⁷⁶ According to Schmidt, adverbs in ^o*yā*

⁷⁴ Whitney (*ibid.*). Bopp (1860: 1168) explains these forms with euphonic insertion of *-y-* between vowels, which he notes does not occur uniformly.

⁷⁵ So for example AiG III 75ff., though Debrunner does not rule out the possibility of later reanalysis.

⁷⁶ Schmidt rejects an earlier theory that adverbs in *-uyā* could be adverbial retentions of instrumentals that are otherwise replaced by new forms in *-vi(y)ā*; for example, the phonetic **vasuyā* has been replaced later by *vásvyā*

from other stem types must come from a different source altogether. In his view, the nominal bases of adverbs such as *naktayā́* ‘by night’ and semantically-related *svapnayā́* ‘in a dream’ are not comparable to the adjectival *a*- and *u*-stems underlying the majority of °*yā́* adverbs. Brugmann (1892: 629f.) slightly revises Schmidt’s explanation so as to not exclude *o*-stem substantives, like *svapnayā́*, from the analogical influence of *ayā́* and other -*yā́* adverbs.

Bartholomae (1889: 20f., fn. 4) proposes a competing theory that -*ayā́* adverbs originate as *a*-stems in locative singular -*e* that have been unverbated with the post-position *ā́* ‘near (to), toward.’ The construction is common in Avestan and Old Persian, where it optionally undergoes univertation.⁷⁷ Select examples include OAv. *xśaθrōi.ā́* ‘under the rule (of)’, OAv. *hādrōiīā́* ‘in the right way,’⁷⁸ OAv. *akōiīā́* ‘in a bad way’; YAv. *Vo^urukaśaiia* ‘on (lake) Vourukaśa,’ YAv. *ašaiia* ‘in the right way,’ YAv. *zastaiia* ‘in the hand’ = OP *dastayā́*.⁷⁹

The syntagm locative -*e* + *ā́* is represented in Vedic as well, but it does not undergo regular synchronic univertation, at least not to the same extent as in Iranian. YAv. *zastaiia* and OP *dastayā́* have a parallel in Vedic *hāste ā́* (VI.18.9), rather than a unverbated *hastayā́**. In the RV we also encounter *upāké ā́* ‘nearby’ (I.27.6, IV.11.1), *parāké ā́* ‘in the distance,’ *astamīké ā́* ‘close to home’ (I.129.9), and numerous others. Given that univertation under these circumstances is non-obligatory in Avestan and Old Persian, where the construction is more common than it is in Vedic, it should be no surprise that not every sequence of locative -*e* + *ā́*

through the influence of *vāsvī*. Adv. *sādhuyā́* and *raghuyā́*, if they are f. inst. in origin, could be preserved in their early phonetic form because at the time of the change **vasuyā* > *vāsvyā* they were not synchronically perceived as case-forms of *sādhvī* and *raghvī*. Of all adverbs in -*uyā́*, only the these two exist alongside f. derivatives in -*vī*. At any rate, the particularly old and frequent adverb *urviyā́* 23×, II+ (: *urú-*, f. *urvī-*) shows that forms in the regular -*iyā́* could equally be used with adverbial function. This makes this tenuous story of their origin still more implausible for the group as a whole, and at any rate it offers no insight regarding the final accent.

⁷⁷ Hoffmann-Forssman (1996: 116, 118f.)

⁷⁸ Insler (1975: 204) deems *hādrōiīā́* “a mistake for orig. **hādrāyā́*, whose vocalism, like that of following *jōyā́*, has been influenced by *aojōi* in the course of the recitation of the Gāthās....The form is instr. of a stem *hādrāya-* ‘correct conduct,’ a compd. of *hādra-* (-*ra-* var. of Ved. *sādhú-*) and *ā́ya-*. Its sense comes very close to that of Ved. *sādhuyā́*.” Bartholomae (1904: 1802) analyses it as the inst. sg. of a feminine *ā*-stem.

⁷⁹ Hoffmann-Forssman (1996:116ff.) analyzes all of these as loc. *a*-stems in *-*ai* unverbated with *ā́*.

results in *-ayā́*. It is more significant that two of those sequences coexist with attested *-(a)yā́* adverbs. *ṛtayā́* ‘in the right way’ (II.11.12) corresponds exactly with YAv. *ašaiia*, but *ṛté ā́* ‘in truth’ (3×, VI+) is also found. It appears that *ṛté ā́* is the synchronically productive construction, while unverbated *ṛtayā́* is a fossilized inheritance.

(50) *tvé indra ápi abhūma víprāḥ*
dhíyam vanema ṛtayā́ sápanṭaḥ (II.11.12ab)

‘We inspired poets have abided by you, Indra. Serving **according to the truth**, we would gain insight.’

(51) *mūrdhānam diváḥ aratim pṛthivyāḥ*
vaiśvānarām ṛté ā́ jātám agním (VI.7.1ab)

‘The head of heaven, the spoked wheel of the earth, Agni Vaiśvānara, **born in truth**’

Similarly, the syntagm *mádhye ā́* ‘in the middle (of)’ (5×, III+) is produced synchronically in the RV, next to *madhyā́* (4×, II+). The overlap of usage suggests that the latter is indeed haplologized **madhyayā́*, a unverbated adverb.

(52) *madhyā́ kártoḥ ní adhāt sákma dhíraḥ* (II.38.4b)

‘**in the middle** of his work the mindful (worker) has set down his craft.’

(53) *vidvān ā́ vakṣi vidúṣaḥ ní satsi*
mádhye ā́ barhīḥ útáye yajatra (III.14.2cd)

‘As one who knows, convey here the knowing (gods). Sit down **in the middle** upon the ritual grass to help us, o you who are worthy of the sacrifice.’

Bartholomae further conjectures that *-ayā́* is later extracted from unverbated forms as a suffix that can also be used with consonant stems. Hirt (1927: 50f.) counters that adverbs in *-ayā́* from consonant stems originate as so-called ‘locatives’ in IIr. **-aj*—which would now be considered allatives—that have similarly undergone unverbation with *ā́*. The base of Ved. *jmayā́/kṣmayā́* ‘on the earth’ could be considered a cognate of Gk. *χαμαί* and Lat. *humi*, which

lack only the addition of *ā́*. Bartholomae and Hirt agree that eventually, though still in IIr., *°uyā́* adverbs are formed from *u*-stems through the analogy *-am : -um :: -ayā́ : x*.

I leave it for others to resolve which solution is preferable. It is enough for my present purposes to point out that the literature has changed its tune regarding the origin and accent of *°yā́* adverbs. While they were once routinely explained by ‘adverbial accent shift,’ for some time now there has been a general consensus⁸⁰ that the formerly common conception of *-ayā́* as inst. sg. of f. *ā*-stems does not satisfy. As a result, they provide no conclusive evidence that a shift of accent can be used to mark case-forms for adverbial use.

3.2 Adverbs in productive *-tarám*

Adverbs in *-ayā́* are mistaken for synchronic feminine instrumentals when in fact they are more likely derived by suffixation. The situation is similar with adverbs in *-tarám*, which have been analyzed as neuter singular comparative adjectives in adverbial use, when in fact *-tarám* (later *-tarám̄*) is a productive suffix added directly to preverbs.

There are a number of Ṛgvedic adverbs in preverb + *-tarám*, which function as comparatives of adverbial preverbs. In the late Vedic period *-tarám* is supplanted by a lengthened feminine *-tarám̄*.⁸¹ Of the adverbs under (§54) below, post-RV *uttarám̄/-ám̄* ‘further on, hereafter’ is occasionally singled out as an accusative case-form with adverbial accent shift due to the availability of a corresponding adjectival stem *úttara-* ‘higher, later.’ Others take the contrasting pair *úttara-/uttarám* as proof that the entire class of *-tarám* adverbs may be regarded

⁸⁰ Notwithstanding the recent repetition of the old analysis by Gotō (2003: 148), who cites *sumn-ayā́*, *dhr̥ṣṇu-yā́*, *anuṣṭhu-yā́*, *amu-yā́* as feminine instrumental adverbs of manner, which are “often with accent shift.”

⁸¹ Already in the RV *saṃtarám* ‘closer together’ VIII.33.19 is formed with a lengthened suffix *-tarám̄*, which replaces *-tarám* in the post-Ṛgvedic period. This produces lengthened variants of the RV *-tarám* adverbs, as well as new forms *atitarám̄* and *nitarám̄/natarám̄*.

as products of accent shift, with their origin in the neuter accusative singular of comparative -*tara-* adjectives.

(54) COMPARATIVE ADVERBS IN *-tarám/-tarām*

pratarám ‘further, more, in future’ 18×, IV+; *-tarām* VS, ĀŚ (: *prá* ‘forward’), cf. YAv.

fratarəm, Gk. πρότερον Pi.+

vitarám ‘further away (in space or time)’ 8×, II+; *-tarām* ŚB, ĀpŚ (: *ví* ‘apart, away’), cf.

Av. *vītarəm*

avatarám ‘further away’ I.129.6 (: *áva* ‘off, down’)

parātarám ‘further away’ X.59.1-4 (: *pārā* ‘away’)

parastarám ‘further away, further’ X.155.3; *-tarām* AV+ (: *páras* ‘beyond, further’)

saṃtarām ‘closer together’ VIII.33.19 (: *sám* ‘together’)

atitarām ‘better, very much, exceedingly’ ŚB+ (: *áti* ‘beyond’)

apatarám ‘further away’ MS (: *ápa* ‘away, back’), cf. OP *apataram*

uttarám ‘further on, hereafter’ AV+; *-tarām* AV+ (: *úd* ‘upon, over’)

natarām ‘not at all, never’ ŚB (: *ná* ‘not’)

nitarām ‘downwards’ TB; ‘in a low tone’ ŚāṃB (: *ní* ‘down’)

Wackernagel includes *uttarām* in a list of forms intended to demonstrate the productivity of adverbial accent shift.⁸² He regards its final accent as equivalent to that of *uttarāt* ‘from above’ (: *úttara-*), and he ascribes the accent of both forms to the same ‘accent shift’ process that affects diverse adverbs throughout the language, from *apākāt* (: *ápāka-*) and *dakṣiṇā* (: *dákṣiṇa-*) to *dīvā* (: *dīv-*). Adjectives in comparative *-ra-/tara-* derived from preverb bases are indeed normally accented on the initial syllable, such that they maintain the accent of the preverb: e.g. *ádha-ra-* ‘lower’ (11×, II+), *út-tara-* ‘higher, later’ (59×,⁸³ II+), *ápa-ra-* ‘posterior, later’ (30×, II+), *áva-ra-* ‘lower, later, western’ (28×, II+), *án-tara-* ‘inner, nearer’ (18×, II+), *úpa-ra-* ‘under, later, nearer’ (24×, III+). It is true, however, that in adverbial use a number of their case-forms are accented on the ending when used adverbially, e.g. *uttarāt* ‘from above’ (: *úttara-*), *adharāt*

⁸² AiG II/1 21.

⁸³ This inflated figure includes 22 repeats of *úttaraḥ* in X.86.1–23. Each verse repeats the final pāda: *vīśvasmād índra úttaraḥ*.

‘from below’ (: *ádhara-*), *aparám/aparāya* ‘in/for the future’ (: *ápara-*). Each of these four adverbial case-forms makes a minimal pair with a non-adverbial barytone case-form in the same stem.⁸⁴ In contrast, the adverbs in *-tarám/°ám* occur in isolation, for the most part lacking full paradigms or cognates. Nevertheless, Whitney (364) analyzes them as accent-shifted neuter singular case-forms, despite acknowledging that the adjectival *-tara-* derivatives from which *-tarám/°ám* adverbs are supposed to originate are “for the most part not otherwise found in use.”⁸⁵

3.2.1 *-tarám* as an adverbial suffix

Indeed, *uttarám/-ám* is the only *-tarám* adverb that has a corresponding adjectival *-tara-* stem,⁸⁶ barytone or otherwise, and it does not occur before the Atharvaveda. The scarcity of adjectival stems amounts to more than accidental gaps in the corpus. A few *-tarám* adverbs are built to apparent comparative stems that are ill-formed, or at least irregular, according to a regular rule that preverbs in final °*a* form comparative adjectives in *-ra-* rather than *-tara-*.⁸⁷ In spite of this, *áva* and later *ápa* are both bases for adverbs in the full suffix *-tarám*. Presumably, Whitney would derive *avatarám* from an unattested adjectival stem *ávataka-**, but in reality the comparative adjective from *áva* is *ávata-* ‘lower, nearer, later’ (27×, II+). The same is true for the late form *apatarám* ‘further away.’ Rather than *apataka-**, the genuine comparative stem from *ápa* is *ápata-* ‘posterior, later,’ which produces a distinct adverbial n. acc. sg. *aparám* ‘in future’ with apparent accent shift of its own (see below, §4.4).

The formal discrepancies between the adjectival *-ra-/tara-* formation and the adverbial *-tarám* formation lead Gaedicke (1880: 229f.), Delbrück (1888a: 187), and likewise Renou (1938:

⁸⁴ Adverbial *uttarát*, *adharát*, and *aparám/aparāya* are further examined in chapter §5, in conjunction with other thematic case-forms with purported accent shift.

⁸⁵ Nor is he alone in this; Hirt (1895: 279f.), Thomson (1891: 21), and MacDonnell (1910: 103f.) all equate *-tarám* adverbs with other instances of adverbial accent shift throughout the language.

⁸⁶ *vítara-* ‘wider(?)’ (ŚB) is attested, but it is late and uncertain (AiG II/2, p. 101, KEWA 207).

⁸⁷ AiG II/2 217.

121ff.) to suspect that *-tarám* adverbs are not specialized n. acc. sg. case-forms of adjectival stems that have otherwise fallen out of use. Instead, they are independently formed comparative adverbs in a productive *-tarám* suffix, which is added directly to preverbs. The contextual function of *-tarám* adverbs further supports their analysis. It is common, especially in the family books, for *-tarám* adverbs to appear directly alongside the preverbs from which they are derived, in an intensifying capacity.⁸⁸ *pratarám* ‘further’ and *vitaram* ‘widely’ are the most common *-tarám* adverbs, and also the earliest to appear in the Ṛgveda. *vitaram* is found with *ví* in all eight instances in the RV, and *pratarám* is found together with *prá* twice in the family books, and in five total verses.

- (55) *prá tārī agne pratarám nah āyuh* (IV.12.6d)
 ‘(Let) our lifetime be **further** lengthened, Agni.’
- (56) *vitaram ví bhāhi* (VI.1.11d)
 ‘glow **at a distance, more at a distance**’
- (57) *áva sravet aghásamsah avatarám* (I.129.6f)
 ‘The utterer of evil should drain away **lower than low**’

Gaedicke (*ibid.*) points to the accent of *-tarám* as additional evidence in favor of the adverbial suffix analysis. The distinct accent makes it problematic to identify them as adjectival *-tara-* stems, even if such stems were readily available. Renou agrees that the accent is evidence that *-tarám* adverbs are not neuter accusatives of *-tara-* stems, at least synchronically:

This adverbial formation is isolated: no neuter in *-tara-* functions as adverb in the ṚV., and moreover the use of a preverb as the stem, **as well as the oxytonous accentuation**, would suffice to distinguish the type *pratarám*, from the adjectives like *tavástara-madintara-vidúṣtara-*, or like *úttara-*.⁸⁹

⁸⁸ Renou (1938: 121f.) covers this topic in detail, citing a brief earlier treatment by Delbrück (1888a: 195).

⁸⁹ Renou (1938: 122), emphasis mine. I applaud Gaedicke and Renou’s willingness to take the accent seriously, rather than dismissing it out of hand as the result of ‘adverbial accent shift.’

Since *-tarám/°ám* adverbs are formed with an accented suffix rather than by the conversion of n. acc. sg. adjectival *-tara-* stems, there is no reason to believe that a genuine ‘shift’ occurs in the formation of each individual *-tarám/°ám* adverb. It is irresponsible to assume that the oxytone accent in the adverbs under (§54) results from adverbial accent shift, when they are not demonstrably derived from barytone adjectives in the first place. Yet, it must be admitted that the question of the accent is not entirely resolved by simply recognizing that *-tarám/°ám* is a productive suffix. Although he does affirm that the adverbial formation is isolated from adjectival *-tara-*, Renou (1952: 327) still ascribes the accent of the *-tarám/°ám* suffix itself to adverbial accent shift, since comparative *-tara-* does not generally attract the accent when it is used to form adjective stems. Renou offers no details regarding when the shift presumably occurred.

There are many parallels between Renou’s treatment of *-tarám* and the traditional explanation of the *-vát* suffix, which is generally regarded as n. acc. sg. *-vant* affected by an exceptionally early adverbial shift of accent, at some vague point prior to becoming an accented productive suffix. Like *-vát*, *-tarám* is synchronically productive and always accented. Both suffixes resemble the neuter accusative singular form of a productive adjective type, aside from the accent. I argued in chapter §1 that the apparently irregular accent of the productive *-vát* type can be traced to a particular early model whose accent can be attributed to independent circumstances. Perhaps the same is true of the *-tarám* type. ‘Adverbial accent shift’ has been relied on purely out of convenience to explain final accent in *-tarám/°ám*, with only circumstantial support. No serious attempt has yet been made to identify an independent and case-specific explanation of final accent in *-tarám*.

3.2.2 Adverbial *-tarām* and *-tamām*

Thus far we have focused exclusively on the accentual properties of comparative *-ra-/tara-*, but the accent of superlative derivatives in *-ma-/tama-* may shed light on the situation. As a rule, derivatives in *-tara-* and *-tama-* agree in accent, which they almost always maintain from the basis. Thus:

(58) ACCENT OF REGULAR DERIVATIVES IN *-tara-*, *-tama-*

júṣṭa-, adj. ‘welcoming’ → *júṣṭa-tara-* ‘more welcoming’ VIII.96.11
 → *júṣṭa-tama-* ‘most welcoming’ I.87.1, I.163.13

kaví-, adj. ‘wise’ → *kaví-tara-* ‘wiser’ VII.86.7
 → *kaví-tama-* ‘wisest’ 5×, III+

In fact, adjectival stems of comparison derived from preverbs constitute an accentually irregular subgroup. It is only here that we encounter a systematic accentual mismatch between barytone comparatives in *-ra-/tara-* and oxytone superlatives in *-má-/tamá-*. Only *ántara-/ántama-*, which agree in accent, break with this trend.

Base	Comparative	Superlative
<i>ádha</i> *‘below’ ⁹⁰	<i>ádha-ra-</i> ‘lower’	<i>adha-má-</i> ‘lowest’
<i>ápa</i> ‘away, back’	<i>ápa-ra-</i> ‘later’	<i>apa-má-</i> ‘last’
<i>áva</i> ‘away, down’	<i>áva-ra-</i> ‘below, behind’	<i>ava-má-</i> ‘lowest, last’
<i>úpa</i> ‘near’	<i>úpa-ra-</i> ‘nearer’	<i>upa-má-</i> ‘nearest’
<i>úd</i> ‘up’	<i>út-tara-</i> ‘upper’	<i>ut-tamá-</i> ‘uppermost’
* <i>h₁en</i> ‘in’ ⁹¹	<i>án-tara-</i> ‘inner’	<i>án-tama-</i> ‘innermost’

Table 3A – COMPARATIVE & SUPERLATIVE STEMS FROM PREVERBS

Of course, this does not affect the claim that *-tarám/ám* adverbs have undergone adverbial accent shift, because even within this exceptional subgroup the *-ra-/tara-* stems are assigned

⁹⁰ See Grassmann 43 under *ádhama-*.

⁹¹ EWA I 75ff.

barytone accent. However, we should consider that there is also a small group of late Vedic superlative adverbs in *-tamām* (and one late *-tamám*).

(59) SUPERLATIVE ADVERBS IN *-tamám/-tamām*

anutamām ‘most’ ŚB (: *ánu* ‘after, along’)
uttamám ‘at last, lastly’ ŚB (: *úd* ‘upon, over’)
natamām ‘not at all, never’ MS (: *ná* ‘not’)
pratamām ‘especially, particularly’ ŚB, AitB (: *prá* ‘forward’)

Of these adverbs, which occur only in late Vedic, all except *anutamām* match up with post-RV comparative adverbs in *-tarām* under (§54). There is good reason to believe that the superlative adverbs under (§59) are formed in by adding the productive accented suffix *-tamām* directly to preverb bases—in other words, they are neither inherited nor derived from adjectival *-tama-* stems. Once again, we find a lack of adjectival stems (aside from *uttamá-*) that correspond to these adverbs. In the case of *pra-tamām*, there are apparent cognates of a stem **pratamá-* in YAv. *fratāma-* and OP *fratama-* ‘foremost,’ but the Vedic adverb is attested quite late and is synchronically isolated. In earlier Vedic, the superlative degree of *prá* is provided by n. acc. sg. *prathamám* ‘at first, at once’ RV+, a case-form of the inherited stem *prathamá-* ‘first, foremost.’ *pratamām*, on the other hand, appears to be a secondary innovation in productive *-tamām*, like the rest of the forms under (§59).⁹²

⁹² *prathamá-* is probably a combination of the suffixes *-tha-* and *-ma-*, or possibly the result of contamination from *-tama-* and *-tha-*. See EWA II 179; AiG III 404f., where it is concluded that *pratamām* is the younger formation. Other suggestions have been made. Reflexes of **th* are restricted to Indic (cf. Pali *pathamo*, Prakrit *paḍhamo*), while Avestan is representative of the **t* found in all other branches (YAv. *fratāmō*, OP *fratamā*, Middle Persian *fratom*). Since there is also a Vedic adverb *pratamām* ‘at first’ with a *t* that corresponds to the Iranian reflexes, it has been suggested (e.g. by Brugmann Grdr.² 2 227) that **pratama-* is the genuine inherited superlative next to comparative **pratara-* ‘prior’ (cf. YAv. *fratarəm*, Gk. πρότερος), and that the innovated aspirate *th* of *prathamá-* may emerged under the analogical influence of Vedic ordinals such as *caturtháh* ‘fourth,’ *pañcathah* ‘fifth’ (YAv. *puxḍō*), *ṣaṣṭháh* ‘sixth,’ *saptáthah* ‘seventh’ (YAv. *haptaḥō*). Bartholomae (IF 22, 115f.), however, finds it unlikely that an inherited **pratamá-* would acquire an aspirated *th* on the model of higher ordinals like *catur-tha-* ‘fourth,’ which at any rate end in *-tha-* rather than *-thama-*, especially when synchronically there are other ordinals in *-tama-* in the language (e.g. *śata-tamá-* ‘hundredth’).

Although adverbs in *-tarám̄* and *-tamám̄* are frequently considered side-by-side in philological and morphological contexts, *-tamám̄/ám̄* adverbs are continually omitted from discussions of adverbial accent. Despite the fact that *-tama-* and *-tara-* stems alike are generally barytone, nowhere in the literature is it claimed that *-tamám̄/ám̄* adverbs have undergone an adverbial shift of accent. Considering the relatively late date of attestation for the *-tamám̄/ám̄* adverbs, it is also easy to imagine that they are directly modeled on those in *-tarám̄/ám̄*, rather than deriving from adjectival *-tama-* stems. But I suspect that the main reason *-tamám̄/ám̄* is not mentioned alongside *tarám̄/ám̄* apropos of adverbial accent is simply because superlative adjective stems derived from preverbs are already oxytone.⁹³

-tamám̄/ám̄ is of no direct help in explaining the final accent of *-tarám̄/ám̄*, since the latter predates it. But it does establish that formations in comparative *-tara-* and superlative *-tama-* are sufficiently connected in the minds of speakers to exert mutual influence. The fact that there is an established presence of oxytone superlative stems derived from preverbs suggests the possibility that analogy played a role—if not on the model of productive *-tamám̄/ám̄*, then perhaps on the model of some early superlative adverb.

3.2.3 *prathamám* and *pra-tarám*

We can be certain that the vast majority of *-tarám̄/ám̄* and *-tamám̄/ám̄* adverbs are not derived from synchronic thematic adjectives with accent shift; instead, they are derived by adding an accented suffix directly to a preverb or indeclinable adverb. Yet, there must have been an original model for the formation. In all likelihood, the suffix was extracted from an early adverbial form and spread analogically to new preverb bases, in which case the reason for apparent ‘accent shift’ in the adverb type as a whole may be specific to that early model. Several

⁹³ AiG II/2 607ff.

meaning ‘earlier, before,’ but the adverbial use is an independent post-Homeric innovation that is not to be connected to Vedic *pratarám*.⁹⁶ Even though it is unlikely that *pratarám* and Gk. πρότερον (for example) are inherited from a common adverbial ancestor in the proto-language, it is not unreasonable to regard them as independent developments of the same morphological elements.

While Vedic *-tara-* is certainly inherited, it is not originally an IE comparative suffix. Its original function appears to be the marking of binary contrasts, e.g. δεξι-τερό- ‘on the right’ (cf. δέξι-ο- ‘right’) as opposed to ἀρισ-τερό- ‘on the left’ (cf. ἄριστ-ο- ‘left’). *-tarám* itself is clearly composed of more than one morpheme. The initial *-tar-* element is strikingly similar in form and meaning to the locative **(t)er* suffix seen in Ved. *an-tár* ‘inside’ and *up-ár(i)* ‘above,’ Gk. ὑπ-έρ ‘above,’ Lat. *in-ter* ‘between’ and *sup-er* ‘above.’ The final *-ám* element seems to be a special add-on, which invites comparison with ‘deictic’ pronominal adverbs in *-ám*, e.g. m. nom. sg. *ay-ám*, m. acc. sg. *im-ám*, neut. sg. *id-ám* ‘here, now, forthwith’ (cf. Lat. *idem* ‘the same, likewise’).

**(t)er* is one of a series of inherited adverbial morphemes that appear with and without an initial *t*. Compare genitive/ablative **(t)os*, e.g. Ved. *i-tás* ‘from here’ and *pur-ás* ‘before,’ Gk. ἐν-τός ‘within’ and πᾶρ-ος ‘sooner, previously,’ Lat. *in-tus* ‘(from) inside’, and locative/allative **(t)i*, e.g. Ved. *prá-ti* ‘to, against’, Gk. πρό-τι/προ-τί/πρός ‘furthermore, thereto’ (cf. Lat. *pretium* ‘price, worth’ < **préti-o-*, ‘the opposite equivalent’). There does also seem to be an inherited IE **-tem* suffix, seen in Lat. *au-tem* ‘however, on the other hand’ (cf. Gk. αὐ̃(τε)/αὐ̃(τάρ) ‘id.,’ etc.). The fact that we encounter adverbial forms in both *-em* and *-tem*

with YAv. *fratarəm* ‘in front, in front of.’ Bartholomae (1907–08: 22), on the other hand, contends that *pratarám* is an independent innovation in Vedic.

⁹⁶ Adv. πρότερον (Pi.+). Homer employs the n. pl. τὰ πρότερα adverbially, and does not use πρότερον in this way. As an ordinary neuter accusative singular case-form in adverbial use, barytone πρότερον cannot be taken as evidence of the original accentuation of Vedic *pratarám*.

suggests that the **-ém* that we see as the accented *-ám* of *pra-tar-ám*, et al. and potentially also the superfluous *-ám* in adverbial Vedic pronouns could actually be the *t*-less form of an inherited **(t)em* morpheme belonging to the same adverbial series. It is worth considering, then, that the so-called ‘comparative suffix’ *-tarám* originates as a sequence **-ter* + adverbial **-ém*. The thematic adjective in *-tar-a-* would then be a parallel development, rather than the basis of the adverb.

3.3 Conclusion

In this chapter we have seen the illusion of ‘adverbial accent shift’ come about due to modern misanalysis. It has long been recognized that *-yá* and *-tarám* are adverbial suffixes. This being the case, forms like *ṛtayá* and *pratarám* derive directly from *ṛtá-* and *prá*, respectively; although they resemble thematic case-forms, they are not converted from adjectival *ṛtáyā** and *prátaram** by a shift of accent. It is doubtful that even synchronically they were regarded as de-adjectival. Not to be deterred, an idea persists in the literature that the accent of suffixal *-tarám* may be explained by an exceptionally early application of ‘adverbial accent shift.’ While I leave the exact cause for its accent open to debate, I caution against over-reliance on ‘adverbial accent shift’ as an explanation of pure convenience.

CHAPTER 4
ADVERBS IN °CĀ AND THEMATIC °ĀKĀ-

Certain adverbs differ accentually from related adjective stems due to a diachronic change of accent in the adjective stem, and not to a modification that occurs during the formation of the adverb. In this chapter, I address two small groups of adverbial case-forms in which the synchronic illusion of accent shift is ultimately the product of fossilized retentions, suppletive paradigms, and/or false minimal pairs.

Section §4.1 covers thematic adverbs *apākā/-āt* ‘at/from a distance’ and *upāké* ‘nearby.’ The idea that they have undergone a shift of accent is built upon the assumption that they are derived from corresponding barytone adjective stems *ápāka-* and *úpāka-*. I contend, however, that the oxytone accent of the adverbs is regular and underlying. Barytone *úpāka-* can be explained with substantive retraction of accent, while *ápāka-* is better analyzed as an unrelated privative compound *á-pāka-* ‘clever, not ignorant,’ following Jamison (comm. IV.3.2).

Section §4.2 covers instrumental *nīcā* ‘downwards’ and *prācā* ‘forwards.’ Following Kuryłowicz (1937), I argue that these are adverbial retentions from an earlier stage of their respective *-añc-* paradigms rather than innovations marked by a shift of accent.

4.1 Adverbs in thematic °Vkā- stems

Adverbial accent shift has also been identified in several case-forms of thematic stems in °Vkā-. Descriptively there are forms in °Vka- from several unrelated sources; those under discussion here are those which appear to be thematized *-añc-* stems, on account of their

directional/locative semantics and tendency to overlap with attested *-añc-* stems.⁹⁷ Among these, ending-accented loc. *upāké* ‘nearby’ (from an unattested *upāñc-** < *úpa* ‘toward, near’) and inst. *apāká* ‘far away,’ abl. *apākát* ‘from afar’ (: *ápāñc-* ‘turned back or westward’) have drawn special attention, because they alone contrast accentually with barytone adnominal case-forms.

(62) ACCENTUALLY CONTRASTING PAIRS IN ° \bar{V} *ka-*

- a. *úpāka-* ‘close together, neighboring(?)’⁹⁸
 °*ke*, f. du. nom. I.142.7, III.4.6, X.110.6

upāká-

°*ké*, loc. sg. ‘in the vicinity, nearby’ 9×, IV+
 °*káyos*, loc. du. ‘close together’ I.81.4

- b. *ápāka-* ‘coming from a distant place; westward(?)’
 °*kas*, m. nom. sg. VI.11.4
 °*ke*, voc. IV.3.2, VI.12.2
 °*kās*, nom. pl. I.110.2

apāká-

°*kát* ‘from a distant place’ VIII.2.35
 °*ká* ‘in the distance’ I.129.1

The contrast between barytone and oxytone case-forms is commonly attributed to the effects of rightward adverbial accent shift.⁹⁹ The accentual disparity does, for the most part, correspond with a functional divide. All attested barytone forms are either nominative or vocative, and are unambiguously adnominal. With the problematic exception of loc. du. *upākáyos*, the oxytone forms are used only in oblique cases, where they can be understood as locative abstracts

⁹⁷ Not every ° \bar{V} *ká-* stem has a corresponding *-a(ñ)c-* stem attested, and some appear to have been created analogically. In ordinary *-añc-* stems, the non-palatal *-k-* only regularly surfaces in the final position of the endless n. acc. sg., e.g. *niak* ‘downward,’ *prāk* ‘forward’ etc. In this type, the non-palatal variant of the final consonant has been generalized before the thematic vowel.

⁹⁸ Barytone *ápāka-* and *úpāka-* are here glossed according to the traditional analysis, which I bring into question below.

⁹⁹ So by Schmidt (1888: 100), Hirt (1895: 260), Wackernagel (AiG II/1 21), and more recently repeated by Mayrhofer (EWA I 85, 219).

functioning adverbially. Loc. sg. *upāké* occurs nine times in the RV with the adverbial sense ‘in the immediate vicinity.’ Examples (§63–64) below are representative of its typical behavior.

- (63) *bhadram te agne sahasin ānīkam*
upāké ā rocate sūryasya (IV.11.1ab)

‘Auspicious is your face, mighty Agni, it shines here **in nearness** to the Sun’

- (64) *susamdyk te svanīka prātīkam*
vī yāt rukmah ná rocate upāké (VII.3.6ab)

‘Your visage is lovely to see, o you of lovely face, when, like a jewel, you glow **nearby**.’

Adverbial inst. sg. *apākā* and abl. sg. *apākāt* each appear once in the RV.

- (65) *yām tvām rátham indra medhásātaye*
apākā sántam *īsira prañayasi* (I.129.1ab)

‘The chariot which you, o vigorous Indra, lead forward to gain wisdom **though it is far away**—(which) you lead forward, faultless one—’

- (66) *prābhartā rátham gavyántam*
apākāt cid yām ávati (VIII.2.35)

‘**Even from behind** he brings to the fore the cattle-seeking chariot which he helps’

If barytone adnominal forms in *ápāka-* and *úpāka-* were not in the picture, there would be nothing particularly remarkable about the oxytone accent of the adverbs. They are consistent in form and function with numerous oxytone stems in $^{\circ}\bar{V}k\acute{a}-$, which also produce adverbs.¹⁰⁰

- (67) ADVERBIAL OXYTONE ABSTRACTS IN $^{\circ}\bar{V}k\acute{a}-$

arvāké, loc. ‘in proximity’ (: *arvāñc-* ‘turned toward’) VIII.9.15
astamīké, loc. ‘at home, near’ (*ástam* ‘homeward’ + *-īké*¹⁰¹) I.129.9

¹⁰⁰ Additional forms can potentially be included under (§67), though with less certainty. For example Grassmann derives *āké*, loc. ‘in the vicinity’ in II.1.10 from *ā* + *-a(ñ)c-*, but Mayrhofer (EWA I, 158) traces it to *ākenipá-*.

¹⁰¹ Not derived from a preverb, n. acc. sg. *ástam* ‘homeward’ + *īká-* seems to have been created analogically after *samīké*. It recalls its antonym, *parāké*, from the pāda immediately preceding it: *sácasva nah parākā ā | sácasva astamīká ā* ‘Accompany us in the distance; accompany us close to home’ (I.129.9de).

parāké, loc. ‘in the distance’ (: *pārāñc-* ‘turned away’) 3×, VII+
parākāt, abl. ‘from a distance’ (*ibid.*) 7×, VII+; °*kāt-tāt* VIII.92.27
samīké, loc. ‘in battle,’ i.e. ‘at the coming together/clash’ (: *samyāñc-* ‘going together’) 5×, III+
samanīkéṣu,¹⁰² loc. pl. ‘at the battle-lines’ X.107.11
ānūkām, acc. ‘from behind, consecutively (?)’ V.33.9 (: *anvāñc-* ‘going after’)
sākām, acc. ‘together, at the same time’ 40×, II+ (< **sṃ-h₃k^u-ó-*, cf. YAv. *hakaṭ*)

Adverbial *apākā́*, *apākāt* and *upāké* behave parallel to the case-forms under (§67) with respect to locatival abstract semantics, adverbial function in oblique cases, and accent. It strikes me as an odd oversight, then, that these three are continually isolated from other adverbial °*Vká-* stems in the literature where ‘adverbial accent’ is concerned. To my knowledge, none of the adverbs under (§67) has been said to show adverbial accent, for the simple reason that none of them form accentually contrasting pairs with barytone stems. Only in the cases of *upāká-* and *apāká-* are there barytone comparanda to encourage a different analysis of the underlying stem accentuation. But for the sake of economy, oxytone adverbs *apākā́/-āt* and *upāké* should be regarded as formally analogous to other adverbs that have comparable form and function. If we no longer take it as a foregone conclusion that ‘adverbial accent shift’ can conveniently account for any kind of accentual irregularity in any given adverb, it becomes clear that the real outliers in this group are the barytone adnominals in *ápāka-* and *úpāka-*, and not the regularly oxytone adverbial case-forms. The most straightforward solution is to reconstruct underlying oxytone accent for all of the stems with abstract locatival semantics, including *apāká-* and *upāká-*, which lifts the explanatory burden from the oxytone adverbs. Meanwhile, barytone case-forms of both *úpāka-* and *ápāka-* can be accounted for without positing either redundant stems or extraneous processes, as I argue in the following sections.

¹⁰² Loc. pl. *samanīkéṣu* is a late creation after *samīké* or *ánīke*, possibly influenced by both. Wackernagel-Debrunner take it as *sam + ánīka-* (AiG II/1 261; so also EWA II 704), but if so the ending accent requires further explanation, since *ánīke* is barytone even when it functions adverbially/prepositionally (see below). Later (AiG II/2 520) the same stem is analyzed as *saman-íká-* from adv. *samaná*, on the model of *samīká-*.

4.1.1 Barytone *úpāka-* in context

The strongest argument for underlying oxytone accent in *apāká-* and *upāká-* comes from m. loc. du. *upākáyos*, which is found once in RV I.81.4. This form has ending accent like *upāké*, which supposedly reflects an adverbial accent shift to the ending. Mayrhofer takes *upāké* and *upākáyos* both to mean ‘in der Nähe,’ which allows adverbial accent shift to account for both forms. But there is no precedent for a dual case-form to be used as an adverb in this way,¹⁰³ and since a m. loc. du. referent is available, there is every reason to accept the otherwise universal view that *upākáyos* is simply an adjective modifying m. loc. du. *hástayos*.

(68) *śriyé ṛṣváh upākáyoh*
ní śiprī́ hárivān dadhe
hástayoh vájram āyasám (I.81.4c-e)

‘For splendour the lofty belipped possessor of fallow bays has taken the metal mace into his own **clasped hands**.’

Since *upākáyos* establishes the existence of an oxytone stem *upāká-*, Thomson (1891: 38) derives adverbial *upāké* from the same underlyingly oxytone stem. Grassmann similarly lists *upāká-* and *úpāka-* as two separate stems, identical in all respects except for an incidental discrepancy of accent, in order to account for just three attested Ṛgvedic case-forms: loc. sg. *upāké* (9×), loc. du. *upākáyos* (1×), and f. nom. du. *úpāke* (3×).¹⁰⁴ It is theoretically simpler to theorize adverbial *upāké* ‘in the vicinity’ simply maintains oxytone accent from an underlying stem *upāká-* ‘near, close.’ Adnominal loc. du. *upākáyos* is thus completely regular, and there is no need to explain why it shares the ‘adverbial accent shift’ supposedly shown by *upāké*. On the

¹⁰³ Mayrhofer (EWA I 219) cites AiG II/1 21 in support of this claim, but Wackernagel-Debrunner mention only the singular *upāké*. Most adv. case-forms in the RV are singular; occasional plurals are most commonly instrumental, e.g. *uccáís* ‘high above,’ *śanakáís* ‘for a long time,’ *prācaís* ‘forwards,’ *aktúbhis* ‘by night,’ *táviṣṭbhis* ‘with might,’ and sometimes locative, e.g. *aparī́ṣu* ‘in future.’ Plural adverbs are more common in the post-Ṛgvedic language. See MacDonnell (1910: 427ff.) and Whitney (§1110-17, p.361ff.).

¹⁰⁴ Incidentally, both Thomson and Grassmann accept the standard doctrine of adverbial accent shift in the case of *apāká/-át*.

other hand, under this scenario it becomes necessary to motivate the barytone accent of adnominal *úpāka-*, which has never before required special consideration.

The only evidence of the barytone stem is f. nom. du. *úpāke*, which is used three times in the RV with f. du. *uśásā* and f. du. compounds *náktośásā* and *uśásānákta*, all of which mean ‘night and dawn.’¹⁰⁵

(69) *á bhándamāne uśásā úpāke*
utá smayete tanúvā virūpe (III.4.6ab)

‘Becoming joyful here, Dawn and Night, are **close by**, and they both smile, though in body they have different forms’

(70) *á bhándamāne úpāke*
náktośásā supésāsā
yahví ṛtásya mātārā
sídatām barhír á sumát (I.142.7)

‘Being happy, let well-ornamented Night and Dawn, the two youthfully exuberant mothers of truth, sit **close together** on the ritual grass.’

(71) *á suśváyantī yajaté úpāke*
uśásānákta sadatām ní yónau (X.110.6ab)

‘Richly fertile, worthy of the sacrifice—**close together** let **Dawn and Night** sit down here in the womb’

J&B’s translation takes f. nom. du. *úpāke* as an adjective in apposition to the f. du. compounds, meaning ‘close together.’ Geldner does likewise, using the adjectives *nachbarlich* and *benachbart* ‘neighboring, neighborly.’ In all of these verses the same sense would be preserved if the stem *úpāka-* were instead taken as a personal substantive, here feminine, meaning ‘the close-together one(s),’ i.e. ‘the neighbor(s).’ We would be seeing in f. du. *úpāke* an apparent case of substantive retraction. The structural similarity of X.110.6 (above) to X.70.6, which shares an identical pāda b, lends some support to this reading of *úpāke*.

¹⁰⁵ It appears as *upāke* in a corresponding AV passage 5.12.6, 27.8.

(72) *devī divó duhitārā suśilpé*
uṣāsānāktā sadatām ní yónau (X.70.6ab)

‘Let the two **goddesses**, the handsomely adorned **daughters** of Heaven,
Dawn and Night, sit down in the womb.’

In X.70.6, the f. du. compound ‘Dawn and Night’ is in apposition to unambiguous substantives *devī* and *duhitārā*. It is easier to make sense of X.110.6 if loc. du. *úpāke* fills the same role there as well. The resulting half-verse might be better understood to read, ‘Let the richly fertile **neighbors** worthy of sacrifice, Dawn and Night, sit down in the womb.’

Next to *úpāka-* there are other Vedic barytone °*Ṽka-* stems derived from preverbs and other adverbial elements + **-h₃k^u-o-*.¹⁰⁶ These stems are substantives which denote ‘that which is *x*,’ where *x* is the relative location indicated by the adverbial base, and they are primarily specialized to name body parts. Although *úpāka-* does name a body part as these comparable barytone stems do, the forms are all comparable inasmuch as they are concrete substantives (‘that which is *x*’) rather than either adjectives or locatival abstracts (‘*x*-ness’).

(73) BARYTONE SUBSTANTIVES IN -*Ṽka-*

abhīka-,¹⁰⁷ n. ‘front, face’ acc. °*kam*, loc. °*ke* 22×; III+

ánika-, n. ‘mouth, face, front’ 6× °*kam*, 6× loc. °*ke*, 2× °*ā*, 3× °*aís*, 1× °*eṣu*; II+

prātīka-, n. ‘the front face, surface; face, esp. of Agni’ 8× °*kam*, °*kena*; VI+ (: *pratyāñc-*
‘turned towards’ < *prāti*)

ánūka-, m./n. ‘the back part’ AV+ (: *anvāñc-* ‘going after’ < *ánu* ‘after’)

úrūka-, n. ‘rectum’ AitB (: *uru-vyāñc-/urūc-* ‘widely extending’ < *urú* ‘wide(ly)’)

Some of these concrete substantives have developed a secondary prepositional or adverbial sense in the locative, but nominal and adverbial usage are not formally distinguished. Loc. sg. *abhīke* is

¹⁰⁶ EWA II 177. See also AiG II/2 519f.

¹⁰⁷ The second-syllable accent of *abhīka-* differs from the other forms in this group, which are otherwise accented on the initial syllable. Though it is difficult to be certain with the limited data, it appears that the rule is to maintain the accent of the initial adverbial member. Compare *abhīka-* ~ *abhi* ‘over, upon, toward’ to *prātīka-* ~ *prāti*, *ánūka-* ~ *ánu*. An exception is the late form *úrūka-*, on which see EWA I, 227; AiG II/2 498.

consistently used as a preposition/adverb to mean ‘in the face (of)’ > ‘in front (of), before.’ Loc. sg. *ánīke* ‘in front of’ shows the same development, although half of the time it more literally refers to ‘the face’ of Agni or Dawn. The position of the accent is fixed in all of these stems, regardless of context or function. At the very least, *abhīke* and *ánīke* show that adverbial accent shift is not obligatory in adverbially-used case-forms of barytone ° \bar{V} *ka*- stems.

The list under (§73) includes a substantive *ánūka*-, m./n. ‘the back part’ AV+ (: *anváñc*- ‘going after’), which is unattested in the RV, but assumed to exist already on the basis of a further derivative *anūkya*, n. ‘backbone, spine’ X.163.2 (and AV+). Possibly related is an unclear Ṛgvedic hapax *ānūkām*, which Renou (1952: 325) translates ‘par derrière.’ It is thought to be a thematic derivative of an *-añc*- stem built from a lengthened variant of *ánu*.¹⁰⁸ If this etymology is correct, the two forms show the expected divide between the barytone concrete substantive on the one hand, and the oxytone locatival adjective on the other. But the fact that an irregularly lengthened initial *ā*- is seen in one form and not the other suggests that the two thematic types can be created independently, and need not necessarily have a derivational relationship in either direction. *úpāka*- ‘near one, neighbor’ could either be conceived of as a direct substantivization of the oxytone adjective stem *upāká*- ‘near,’ or as an independent creation like *ánūka*- appears to be. In either case, adverbial accent shift is irrelevant.

4.1.2 Barytone *ápāka*- in context

Like *upāká*- ‘near(ness)’ and other ° \bar{V} *ká*- stems with exclusively adverbial case-forms, the stem *apāká*- ‘far away, distant’ can also be understood as underlyingly oxytone. Adverbs *apākā* and *apākāt* are thus regular, leaving only barytone *ápāka*- in need of explanation. It is generally accepted that *ápāka*- is a thematic derivative from *ápāñc*- ‘turned backward.’ It appears most

¹⁰⁸ On *ánu* ~ *ānu*, see EWA I, 73f. and references therein.

often as a compound member, occurring three times in *sv-ápāka-* and once more as the initial member in *ápāka-cakṣas*. Both are used as epithets of Agni. The standard translation of *svápāka-* is ‘having a good backside,’ while *ápāka-cakṣas* is taken to mean ‘having eyes in the back.’¹⁰⁹ On the basis of these compounds, *ápāka-* could be considered another barytone substantive meaning ‘the back (part).’ However, it is far more difficult to make sense of a substantive reading in RV I.110.2, where the simplex adjective stem modifies m. nom. pl. *āpāyas* ‘friends.’ Here it is usually taken to mean ‘westward.’

Oldenberg (1897: 325ff.) offers a long-ignored alternative analysis of (-)*ápāka-*, which has recently been endorsed by Jamison & Brereton (2014). Though he would later abandon this idea in favor of the mainstream view, Oldenberg takes voc. sg. *svápāke* to mean ‘O most skilful one.’ This translation reflects a privative compound analysis of *á-pāka-* from the adjective *pāka-* ‘callow, simple(ton)’ 9×, III+.¹¹⁰ Thus *á-pāka-* means ‘not-simple,’ and therefore ‘clever, skilful.’ Jamison (comm. IV.3.2) finds this reading preferable to the mainstream alternatives on contextual and semantic grounds. The construction has a close Ṛgvedic parallel in *á-mūra-* ‘not stupid, no fool’ (19×, III+) ← *mūr-á-* ‘stupid,’ which is found three times in the Agni hymns of book IV. Jamison also rightly observes that the context of *svápāka-/sú ápāka-* neither requires nor even suggests the standard translation, ‘having a lovely backside.’ Nor does the uncompounded reading ‘distant, coming from afar’ suggest itself in characterization of Agni, who is on the contrary the “most present of the gods.”¹¹¹

¹⁰⁹ The sequence *su + apāka-* is analyzed as *sú ápāka-* twice in the Padapāṭha, and once as a compound *sv-ápāka-* (in IV.3.2), but Geldner, Renou, and Oldenberg (1901: 300f.) treat all three as compounds; see Jamison (comm. VI.12.2) and references therein. Grassmann takes (-)*apāka-* uniformly as ‘coming from afar’: (*sv*)*ápāka-* ‘(schön) von Ferne kommend’ and *ápāka-cakṣas* ‘fernhin/aus der Ferne schauend oder leuchtend.’

¹¹⁰ Scarlata (1999: 16, fn. 26) also notes the possible morphological analysis *á-pāka-*, but he ultimately regards *suapāka* as ‘unklar.’

¹¹¹ Jamison, comm. VI.12.2.

(74) *arvācīnāḥ párivītaḥ ní sīda*
imāḥ u te svapāka pratīcīḥ (IV.3.2)

‘Enveloped, sit down facing our way: here are (hymns) facing you, o **very knowing one.**’

(75) *ádidyutat sú ápāko vibhāvā*
ágne yájasva ródasī urūcī (VI.11.4ab)

‘He has flashed, **the very clever**, wide-radiant one. O Agni, perform sacrifice yourself to the two world-halves of broad extent—’

(76) *á yásmin tvé sú ápāke yajatra*
yákṣad rājan sarvátāteva nú dyáuḥ (VI.12.2ab)

‘You in whom heaven in its entirety [=all the gods] will now perform sacrifice, as it were—you **the very clever**, the means of sacrifice, the king—’

The contextual use of the un-negated adjective *pāka-* in the RV further supports the reading of *á-pāka-* as a privative compound. *pāka-* ‘ignorant, child-like’ is almost always used to characterize human ignorance in explicit opposition to the wisdom of the gods, often in opposition to Agni specifically.¹¹² It is entirely plausible that a negated form of *pāka-* could be employed to characterize Agni, given that there is a pre-existing antonymic association between Agni, who is *Jātavedas* and *viśva-vid* ‘all-knowing,’ and mortals who are *pāka-*. There is evidence for this use in the post-RV period, when *á-pāka-* is used to characterize the artisan god Tvaṣṭri.¹¹³

The privative analysis also suits *ápāka-caḥṣas* in VIII.75.7, which describes Agni during a cattle raid. Omniscience is central to Agni’s characterization in the RV. He is said to have ‘a thousand eyes’ (*sahasrākṣáḥ* I.79.12; *sahásram akṣábhīḥ* X.79.5), which is comparable to other ‘all-knowing’ epithets. The construction *sahasra-* ‘thousand’ followed by a body part is not to be understood literally in the RV; rather, it reflects a maximum or totality.¹¹⁴ By having a thousand

¹¹² *pāka-* is used of humanity in contrast to gods in I.164.5, I.164.21, X.7.6, X.28.5; in contrast to Agni specifically in I.31.14, III.9.7, IV.5.2.

¹¹³ Oldenberg (1897: 325) notes this use of *á-pāka-* in Vagbhata Saṃhita XX.44 = Taittiriya Brahmana II.6.8.4 = Maitrayani Saṃhita III.11.1.

¹¹⁴ On the construction *sahasra-* ‘thousand’ followed by a body part, see Srinivasan (1997: 26, fn. 8).

eyes, Agni is ‘all-seeing,’ i.e. possessed of the greatest possible sight. The standard translation of *ápāka-cakṣas* ‘having eyes in the back’ could be metaphorically understood to indicate Agni’s omniscience, but this is a somewhat anachronistic reading and not standard to Vedic. Instead, J&B translate the compound ‘whose eye is not fooled,’ rendering privative *á-pāka-* even more literally than they do elsewhere. The compound appears only once, but J&B’s interpretation straightforwardly reflects Agni’s standard attribute of all-seeing wisdom.

(77) *kám u svit asya sénayā*
agnéḥ ápākacakṣasaḥ
pañim góṣu starāmahe (VIII.75.7)

‘What Paṇi shall we lay low with his weapon, the weapon of Agni **whose eye is not fooled**, when cattle are at stake?’

The similarity of *ápāka-cakṣas-* to *upāká-cakṣas-* in VIII.6.25 should not be taken as evidence that *apāka-* is formed from *ápa* just as *upāká-* : *úpa*. According to Grassmann, the compound means either ‘whose eye is near’ or ‘right before the eye(s).’ The two compounds are differently accented, which either indicates that they are different compound types, or else underscores the point of this section that *upāká-* and *ápāka-* are morphologically distinct. If there is a connection between the two compounds in the minds of speakers, it is more likely on the level of poetic word-play than morphological identity.

(78) *abhí vrajám ná tatniṣe*
sūraḥ upākácakṣasam (VIII.6.25)

‘You extend your control over the one **whose eye is near to the sun**’

M. nom. pl. *ápākās* in I.110.2 is almost universally interpreted as ‘westward’ (cf. n. acc. sg. *ápāk* ‘westward, backward,’ from *apāñc-*), such that it forms an antonymic pair with *prāñcaḥ* ‘facing front, facing eastward’ which immediately follows. As mentioned previously, it is

difficult to reconcile this interpretation of *ápāka-* with the other appearances of the stem in compounds, where it is taken instead to mean ‘back(side).’ Even more problematic is Jamison’s observation that ‘westward’ goes contrary to the overall sense of the passage. Contrasting direction words are frequently used in sequence to indicate that an action occurs omnidirectionally or universally, but Jamison (comm. I.110.2) makes a convincing case that “the Ṛbhus’ journey seems to be purposeful and directed, given the two *prá* forms (...*pra...áitana...prāñcaḥ*) and the fact that they reach a goal.”¹¹⁵

(79) *ābhogāyam prá yád icchánto áitana*
ápākāḥ práñco máma ké cid āpáyaḥ (I.110.2ab)

‘When, facing front, you **shrewd ones** went forth in search of your daily bread, kind of like my pals’

In the context of this hymn, *ápāka-* describes the Ṛbhus—that is, craftsmen who earned divinity by virtue of their exceptional skill, which surpasses that of common mortals. Negating the human mundanity of the Ṛbhus through use of the privative *á-pāka-* ‘skilled, not-simple’ thus serves a thematic purpose in accordance with the Ṛbhu’s unique backstory and the overall focus of the hymn. Jamison & Brereton observe an extra thematic layer operating in this hymn: the poet depicts the Ṛbhus as itinerant skilled workers similar to himself, perhaps in the hope that he too will achieve immortality through his art, just as they did.¹¹⁶ Even if the proposed directional/locative alternatives were not in conflict with the sense of the passage, an epithet of ‘(divinely) clever’ would still be more contextually appropriate in a hymn that celebrates poetic prowess.

¹¹⁵ I am less convinced by their other argument, “Although the direction words frequently co-occur, one might expect the stem formations here to be parallel, that is, using a form of *ápāñc-* rather than a derivative. Cf., e.g., *prág ápāg údāk* (III.53.11, VIII.4.1=VIII.65.1).” Though parallel stem formations certainly can be used when direction words are used in sequence, it is not necessary for them to do so; contrast their examples with *apāciás údak níak purástāt viśá* VIII.28.3.

¹¹⁶ J&B I 257

The ‘very clever’ analysis of *á-pāka-* has the merit of neatly eliminating the need to explain any accentual abnormalities. If barytone adnominals in *á-pāka-* and oxytone adverbial forms in *apāká-* are morphologically unrelated, the appearance of ‘accent shift’ between the two stems is of course purely superficial. Privative *á-* regularly takes the accent when it directly negates the word with which it is compounded.¹¹⁷ Meanwhile, we are able to maintain the theory that adjectival/adverbial *°Vka-* stems are underlyingly oxytone across the board.

The oxytone accent of adverbial *apākā́/-át* and *upāké* is underlying to these stems; they only appear to show ‘adverbial accent shift’ when they are contrasted with barytone forms that have been misanalyzed. In the following section, I cover another pair of adverbial case-forms in which so-called ‘adverbial’ accent is most likely a retention rather than an innovation.

4.2 Instrumental adverbs from *-añc-* stems

The suffix *-a(ñ)c-* derives adjectives of direction from preverbs, prepositions, and adverbs. Descriptively, the case ending *-ā* is irregularly accented in both *nīcā́* ‘downwards’ and *prācā́* ‘forward.’ These appear to be the instrumental case-forms of *-añc-* stems *nīañc-* and *prāñc-*, respectively, whose accent is otherwise fixed throughout the paradigm. Both *nīcā́* and *prācā́* function adverbially, for which reason their accentual irregularity has been attributed to adverbial accent shift.¹¹⁸

(80) ‘ACCENT-SHIFTED’ ADVERBS FROM *-a(ñ)c-* STEMS

nīcā́ ‘down, downwards’ II.13.12, II.14.4, IV.4.4, IV.38.5, VI.8.5, X.34.9, X.152.4 (: *nīañc-* ‘directed downward’)

prācā́ ‘forward, eastwards’ II.26.4, III.31.5, VII.83.1 (: *prāñc-* ‘facing front, eastward’), cf. YAv. *frača* ‘ahead, before’

¹¹⁷ Whitney (§1288a, p. 441).

¹¹⁸ Originally by Lanman (1880: 457), who is followed by Delbrück (1888a: 139, fn. 1), Whitney (§1112e, p. 362), and AiG III 19.

Only with instrumentals in °*cá* is adverbial accent shift credited with drawing the accent from an athematic stem to a case ending. Supposedly ‘accent-shifted’ adverbial forms in instrumental -*ā* are numerous, but the forms can otherwise be categorized either as rightward shifting thematic case-forms, or as leftward shifting oblique root-nouns.¹¹⁹ The explanation for *nīcā́* and *prācā́* thus relies on the assumption that adverbial accent shift is a productive phenomenon capable of targeting any adverbial case-form in the language, which I have already brought into question in previous chapters. Even at the best of times, there are complicating factors regarding the accent of *nīcā́* and *prācā́* that render the ‘accent shift’ analysis questionable. As a group, -*añc-* stems have varied accentual properties and some paradigms show evidence of accentual remodeling. There are other instrumental adverbs in °*cā́*, including *paścā́* ‘later,’ *uccā́* ‘above’ and *tiraścā́* ‘across,’ that could have exerted analogical influence. There are also thematic adverbs *nīcāt/-áis* ‘below’ and *prācáis* ‘forward,’ which suggest that *nīcā́* and *prācā́* were synchronically regarded as thematic forms rather than part of -*añc-* paradigms. There are numerous possible analyses of *nīcā́* and *prācā́* that do not rely on adverbial accent shift. Given the uniqueness of *nīcā́* and *prācā́* among all purported cases of adverbial accent shift and the questionable productivity of the ‘accent shift’ process in the first place, I do not see it as a viable explanation of these two forms, much less a necessary one.

4.2.1 Characteristics of -*añc-* stems¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ No case endings are involved with n. acc. sg. forms in -*vát* and participial -*át*. There are several adverbs in -*u-yá* from *u-*stems and -*ayá* from consonant stems, but these involve suffixation and are not straightforwardly derived by a shift of accent; see §3.1. Rightward ‘accent shift’ to case endings is supposedly common to endings other than inst. -*ā* as well, but these are likewise limited to thematic stems. With athematic stems, of course, shift of accent to oblique endings is generally considered regular ablaut behavior.

¹²⁰ See Scarlata (1999: 17ff.) for a detailed treatment of stems in the ‘suffixoid’ -*añc-* and their derivatives. Although it appears that -*añc-* was originally a compound second-member, synchronically -*añc-* operates as a derivational suffix. I will accordingly refer to ‘-*añc-* stems’ throughout this section.

It is difficult to trace *-añc-* stems to an ultimate origin, and the group as a whole may be an amalgamation of forms from several sources. *-añc-* stems that are derived from base elements in final *ǎ* have two gradations: a strong stem in $^{\circ}\tilde{a}\tilde{n}c-$ and a weak stem in $^{\circ}\tilde{a}c-$, e.g. *ávāñc-/ávāc-* (: *áva*), *satráñc-/satrác-* (: *satrá*). If they derive from bases in final *i* or *u*, *-añc-* stems have three gradations: strong cases in *-añc-*, a ‘middle case’ neuter nom./acc. sg. in endingless *-ak* (< *-ac-*), and weak cases in *-īc-* or *-ūc-*. This pattern applies regardless of the synchronic location of accent, e.g. *pratyáñc-/pratyák/pratīc-* and (with different accent) *viśvañc-/viśvak/viśūc-*. Some have attributed forms in $^{\circ}\tilde{a}\tilde{n}c-$ / $^{\circ}\tilde{a}c-$ to the verbal root $\sqrt{añc}$ ‘bend’ < $*-h_2enk-$ / $*-h_2\eta k-$.¹²¹ Weak stems in $^{\circ}\tilde{i}c-$ and $^{\circ}\tilde{u}c-$, on the other hand, point to an IE contraction of stem final $*i/*u$ and the zero grade of $*h_3k^h-$ ‘eye,’ cf. n. *pratīka-*, Gk. *πρόσωπον* ‘face.’ Forms in both roots may have collapsed into suppletive paradigms. Alternatively, the characteristic *ñ* of the strong stems may have been analogically introduced into original paradigms in ablauting $*-h_3(e)k^h-$, after the model of *nt-*stems in strong stem *-ánt-* and weak stem *-ǎt-*.¹²² A unilateral decision may not be possible, since both explanations may be justified.

In the RV, the accent of *-añc-* stems may remain in a fixed position throughout the paradigm, either on the initial syllable or on $-\tilde{a}(\tilde{n})c-$, or it may show mobility between *-añc-* in the strong cases and the ending in weak cases. The accent moves to the ending in weak cases and f. *ī-*derivatives only if *-án̄c-* is accented in the strong and middle cases.¹²³ The accent does not move from its fixed position when it falls on the base, i.e. to the left of *-añc-*, in the strong stem. This is clearest when both base and *-añc-* stem alike are accented on the initial syllable, e.g. *ápa*

¹²¹ For example Gotō (2009: 44).

¹²² AiG III 230; Kuryłowicz (1935: 42).

¹²³ There is an exception in *uruvyáñc-*, inst. sg. *uruvyácā* ‘extending wide’ 3×, V+ (: *urú-* ‘wide’), but it is exceptional in other ways as well. The *-y-* in the strong stem is introduced after the model of *pratyáñc-*, with the paradigm perhaps further complicated by the mixing of $*ur(u)v-\tilde{a}\tilde{n}c-$ with verbal *uru-vyac-*; see EWA II, 590 and AiG III 230f. There is evidence of a different weak stem *urūc-* from f. *urūcī-*, which is built as if to an unattested stem $*urv-\tilde{a}(\tilde{n})c-$. If *urūcī-* was synchronically associated with *uruvyáñc-* as its feminine derivative, we are looking at a collapse of two competing paradigms.

→ *ápāñc-*. But when *-añc-* is added to a base in final accented *á*, following contraction it cannot be determined whether the accent falls on the final syllable of the base (e.g. *adhará-añc-*) or on the suffix (*adharā-añc-*). The fixed accent on *-á(ñ)c-* throughout the resulting paradigms does suggest, however, that synchronically they were understood to maintain the accent of the base, like the stems in table §4A that maintain fixed initial accent.

STEM	WEAK FORMS	GLOSS	BASE	COGNATE
<i>ápāñc-</i> 7×, III+	<i>ápācas</i> f. <i>ápācī-</i> 2×	‘directed back; western’	<i>ápa</i> ‘back’	YAv. <i>apāñč-</i>
<i>ávāñc-</i> 1×, IV	<i>ávācas</i>	‘directed downward, below’	<i>áva</i> ‘off, down’	
<i>údañc-</i> 6×, II+	—	‘going upwards; turned to the north’	<i>úd</i> ‘upward’	
<i>párāñc-</i> 6×, III+	<i>párācas</i> f. <i>párācī-</i> 1×	‘directed toward; distant’	<i>párā</i> ‘away, to’	YAv. <i>parāñč-</i>
<i>višvañc-</i> 21×, II+	<i>višūcas</i> , ° <i>ūcos</i> f. <i>višūcī-</i> 8×	‘all-pervading; going everywhere’	<i>višu-</i> ‘on both sides’ ¹²⁴	YAv. <i>vīzuuanč-</i>
<i>níañc-</i> 11×, II+	f. <i>nīcī-</i> 7×	‘directed downward’	<i>ní</i> ‘downward’	YAv. <i>niiāñč-</i>

Table 4A – *añc-* STEMS WITH FIXED INITIAL ACCENT

STEM	WEAK FORMS	GLOSS	BASE	COGNATE
<i>adharáñc-</i> 2×, X	° <i>ácas</i>	‘beneath, lower’	* <i>adhará</i> ‘lower’ ¹²⁵	
<i>arvāñc-</i> 84×, II+	° <i>ácā</i> , ° <i>ácas</i> f. <i>arvācī-</i> 4×	‘directed toward, coming hither’	* <i>arvā</i> ¹²⁶	
<i>asmatrāñc-</i> 1×, VI	—	‘directed towards us’	<i>asmatrā</i> ‘with us’	
<i>satrāñc-</i> 4×, VII+	° <i>ácā</i> , ° <i>ácas</i> f. <i>satrācī-</i> 2×	‘going with’	<i>satrā</i> ‘together’	YAv. <i>haθrāč-</i>
<i>višvañc-</i>	f. <i>višvācī-</i> 3×	‘facing all directions’	* <i>višvā</i> ‘in all directions’ ¹²⁷	

¹²⁴ *višu-* occurs only in compounds and derivatives, e.g. *višuna-* ‘varied,’ adv. *višunák* ‘on different sides,’ *višūvánt-* ‘having different sides, in the middle,’ *višu-drúh* ‘harmful on both sides,’ *višu-rūpa-* ‘having varied colors,’ *višū-vít-* ‘turning on different sides’; see EWA II 565. The proper name *višvā(ñ)c-* (I.117.16) apparently derives not from **višu-* but from **višvā-*, cf. *višvátas*, *višvādha*.

¹²⁵ An unattested adverb can be hypothesized on the basis of *adharát* ‘from below’ (AiG III 19). See §5.3.3.

¹²⁶ According to Hoffmann (1956a), *arvāñc-* and *arvāvát-* f. ‘vicinity’ are based on a reconstructed adverb **avrā* (>**arvā*), which he connects with OAv. *aorā-čā*, YAv. *aora* ‘down,’ OP *aurā* (: *avár* etc.).

¹²⁷ I propose that the base of *višvāñc-* is an otherwise-unattested adverb *višvā* ‘in all directions’ (: *višva-* ‘all, every’), cf. *višvátas -tas* ‘from all sides,’ *višvā-tra* ‘everywhere’ X.61.25. It may be compared with numerous adverbs in accented *-á* from thematic stems, many of which show so-called ‘adverbial accent shift.’ See §5.4.

<i>ghṛtañc-</i>	f. <i>ghṛtácī-</i> 18×	‘turned to butter, i.e. butter’	<i>ghṛtá-</i> , n. ‘butter’	
<i>práñc-</i>	° <i>ácas</i> , ° <i>ácas</i> , ° <i>áci</i> f. <i>prácī-</i> 11×	‘facing forward, eastward’	<i>prá</i> ‘toward’	YAv. <i>frāñč-</i>

Table 4B – FIXED ACCENT ON *-á(ñ)c-* (= *-á-a(ñ)c-*)

STEM	WEAK FORMS	GLOSS	BASE	COGNATE
<i>anváñc-</i> 1×, III	° <i>úcás</i> f. <i>anūcī-</i> 1×	‘going after’	<i>ánu</i> ‘after, along’	
<i>dadhyác-</i> 9×, VI+	° <i>ícás</i> , ° <i>icé</i>	PN	<i>dádhi-</i> ‘coagulated milk’	
<i>pratyáñc-</i> 23×, III+	° <i>ícás</i> , ° <i>icī</i> f. <i>pratīcī-</i> 13× ¹²⁸	‘directed toward, to the back/west’	<i>práti</i> ‘to, before’	YAv. <i>paitiianč-</i>
<i>śvityáñc-</i> 3×, II+	° <i>icé</i> f. <i>śvitīcī-</i> 1×	‘becoming white’	* <i>śviti-</i> ‘whiteness’ ¹²⁹	
<i>samyáñc-</i>	f. <i>samīcī-</i> 16×	‘going together, entire’	<i>sám</i> ‘together’ ¹³⁰	
<i>ṛjváñc-</i> 1×, IV	—	‘going straightforward’	<i>ṛjú-</i> ‘straight, right’	
<i>sváñc-</i> 6×, IV+	—	‘going well, swift(?)’	<i>sú</i> ‘well’	

Table 4C – ACCENT MOBILITY BETWEEN *-á(ñ)c-* AND ENDING

The accentual properties of some stems cannot be determined with absolutely certainty, if they are attested only in the strong cases and never in diagnostic weak cases, but they can be theorized based on the behavior of similar *-añc-* stems. For example, it is likely that the accent would fall on the ending in the weak cases of *sv-áñc-* and *ṛjv-áñc-*, because all stems that are unambiguously accented on *-áñc-* in the strong stem have mobile accent in the RV. They also align with the other stems in table §4C in being built to bases in a final semivowel. In contrast, it is likely that the accent of *asmatráñc-* is fixed, since this is the case with all other *-añc-* stems that are derived from adverbs in final accented °*á*. The accent of *údañc-* is also most likely fixed

¹²⁸ But f. acc. sg. *pratīcīm* appears in RV X.18.14, with conflicting accent. See AiG III 18 and §4.2.3 below.

¹²⁹ An *i* stem *śviti-* ‘whiteness’ is constructed from a Caland root √*śvit* ‘be white, bright,’ cf. RV *śvitna-* ‘bright,’ AV+ *śvitrá-* ‘white,’ YAv. *spiti* ‘white’ (EWA II 679).

¹³⁰ *samīcī-* is the feminine adjectival derivative of the stem *sam-y-áñc-*. The *-y-* has been introduced under the influence of *praty-áñc-* (AiG II/2 153; EWA II 705).

throughout its synchronic paradigm, on account of its initial accent in the strong cases; no other stems that are accented on the initial syllable in strong cases show any sort of accent mobility, with the exception of adverbial *nīcā́* itself.

Ordinarily, *-añc-* is accented when it is directly added to bases in final *i* or *u*. *nīañc-* (= *nyañc-*) is one of a number of exceptions to this general rule. All other stems in *°iñc-* as opposed to *°yñc-* contain an element *-dri-* or *-dhri-*, which is uniformly accented.¹³¹ Of these, only *deva-driñc-* is attested in a weak stem (n. inst. sg. *devadrīcā́*), but the fact that the accent in the strong and ‘middle’ stems falls on the base suggests that no mobility would be observed, even if more weak cases were attested. Suffixal *-driñc-* and *-dhriñc-* appear to have been extracted from *asmadriñc-* ‘toward us’ and *sadhriñc-* ‘together,’ respectively, from which point they spread semi-productively to related stems. Like *-añc-* stems derived from adverbs in final *°ā́*, *sadhriñc-* maintains the accent of its adverbial base *sadrī́* ‘fixed on a common goal.’¹³² The accent of both *asmadriñc-* and *sadhriñc-* may have been reinforced by synonymous *asmatrñc-* and *satrñc-*, which also maintain the fixed final accent of the base.

STEM	ATTESTED FORMS	GLOSS
<i>asma-driñc-</i>	<i>°iak</i> 8×, III+ <i>°iñcas</i> 1×, VII	‘directed toward us’
<i>ma-driñc-</i>	<i>°iak</i> 2×, III+ <i>°iñcam</i> 1×, VII ¹³³	‘directed toward me’
<i>ka-driñc-</i>	f. <i>°īcī</i> 1×, I	‘whither directed’
<i>deva-driñc-</i>	<i>°īcā́</i> 2×, I f. <i>°īcīm</i> 1×, III	‘directed toward the gods’
<i>viṣva-driñc-</i>	<i>°iak</i> 1×, VII	‘going in all directions, all-pervading’
<i>sa-dhriñc-</i>	<i>°iak</i> 8×, II+, <i>°iñcā́</i> 1×, I	‘together, toward a common goal’

¹³¹ See AiG II/2 154.

¹³² *sadrī(-īm)* appears only in II.13.2. The only other form of this root to appear in the RV is *sádhres* V.44.10, which Mayrhofer identifies as a Ṛṣi name whose accent is possibly to be explained by vocative retraction.

¹³³ Additional forms *madrik* ‘to me’ 3×, VI+ and *tvadrik* ‘to you’ 2×, X+ are said to be shortenings of *madriñc-* and an unattested *tvadriñc-* ‘directed toward you.’ See AiG III 231 §126cβ.

° <i>iañcas</i> 2×, IV+		
<i>a-ku-dhriac-</i>	° <i>iak</i> 1×, X	‘going no-where, aimless’

Table 4D – STEMS IN *-dri-añc-* & *-dhri-añc-*

4.2.2 Adverbial *nīcā* and *prācā*

The paradigm of *nīa(ñ)c-* is atypical among *-añc-* stems inasmuch as it shows accentual ‘hyper-mobility.’ The accent shifts between the initial syllable in the strong cases and the ending in the instrumental, skipping over the *-añc-* suffix entirely: adverbial inst. sg. *nīcā* (7× II+) contrasts with m. nom. sg. *nīaṅ* (3×), m. acc. sg. *nīañcam* (1×), n. acc. sg. *nīak* (7×). If the irregular instrumental is discounted, *nīa(ñ)c-* can easily be included among the fixed-accent stems in table §4A. The instrumental is the only weak case attested in the RV, and there is no evidence at this stage of a barytone inst. *nīcā** that could confirm whether or not the accentual distinction is predicated on adjectival vs. adverbial function.¹³⁴

(81) *nīcā śántam út anayaḥ parāvṛjam* (II.13.12c)

‘You led him up who was sunk **down** and shunned’

(82) *nīcā tám dhakṣi atasám ná śúṣkam* (IV.4.4d)

‘burn him **down**, like a dry thicket.’

(83) *nīcā áyamānam jásurim ná śyenám* (IV.38.5c)

‘as he makes his way **downward** like a famished falcon towards fame’

The accent of a feminine derivative *nīcī-* (7×, V+) does confirm that *nīcā* is exceptional within its paradigm rather than representative of the general accentual behavior of weak cases of this stem. Descriptively, the accent of feminine *devī-*type derivatives from *-añc-* stems consistently

¹³⁴ A barytone acc. pl. *nīcas* appears in AV II.1.6, but it is not a reliable indicator of the original weak stem accent, since after the RV fixed accent on *-īc-/-ūc-* is generalized for all *-yāñc-* as well as *-yāñc-* stems.

agrees with that of the weak cases.¹³⁵ *nīcī-* shows the fixed barytone accent that we would ordinarily expect of a multisyllabic *-añc-* stem with accent on the initial base in the strong cases.

The accent of *prā(ñ)c-* appears variously fixed or mobile, in different cases. Unlike the exceptional ‘hyper-mobility’ shown by the movement of accent from *nīañc-* to *nīcā́*, the movement of accent from the stem *prāñc-* in strong cases to the case ending in *prācā́* is not unusual, in itself. Movement from an oxytone stem to an oblique case ending is typical of athematic stems in general, and well-represented by the *-añc-* stems in table §4C. The adverb is only revealed to be irregular when contrasted with the rest of the paradigm, which has fixed accent on *-ā(ñ)c-* (= *-á-a(ñ)c-*) in all other weak cases, like the stems in table §4B. In practical terms, for a monosyllabic stem this is equivalent to fixed initial accent. Next to m. nom. sg. *prāñ* 1×, m. acc. sg. *prāñcam* 7×, and m. nom. pl. *prāñcas* 4×, the ending fails to draw the accent in m. acc. pl. *prācas* (3×) and loc. sg. *prāci* (1×). A f. derivative *prācī-* (11×, II+) also corresponds in accent, leaving the instrumental adverb *prācā́* the only exception. No non-adverbial *prācā́** is attested.

(84) *prá tám prācā́ nayati bráhmanaḥ pátiḥ* (II.26.4b)

‘that one does the lord of the sacred formulation lead **to the fore**.’

(85) *prācā́ gavyántaḥ pṛthupársavaḥ yayuḥ* (VII.83.1b)

‘the broad-chested ones have gone **forward** in their quest for cattle.’

(86) *vīláu satīḥ abhí dhīrāḥ atṛndan
prācā́ ahinvan mánasā saptá víprāḥ* (III.31.5ab)

‘The insightful ones bored through to the (cows), though they were in a stronghold.
The seven inspired poets impelled (the cows?) with **advancing** mind’

¹³⁵ AiG II/2 424. Compare m. acc. pl. *visūcas* with f. nom. sg. *viśucī*, m. inst. sg. *satrácā* with f. acc. sg. *satrácīm*, m. acc. pl. *anūcās* with f. dat. sg. *anūcī*, etc.

It has been claimed that *prācā́*, despite having irregularly ‘shifted’ accent, is actually adnominal rather than adverbial in III.31.5. Grassmann, Geldner, J&B take *prācā́* to modify *mānasā*, meaning ‘with advancing mind.’ If they are correct in doing so, it is difficult to maintain the proposition that the ending accent of *prācā́* results from its adverbial specialization. However, it seems to me preferable to follow Cantera (2005: 112), who takes *prācā́* here with *ahinvan*, functioning adverbially as the equivalent of *prā́*.¹³⁶ The verse describes the Aṅgirasas’ efforts to free the sacred cows from the Vala cave by means of poetic song and ritual activity. In this context, an independent *mānasā* can be interpreted as the instrumental of means through which the poets undertake the verbal action, which has a literal sense of forward motion. Under this interpretation, the first half-verse of III.31.5 might read: ‘The seven inspired poets impelled (the cows) forward, **with their mind(s)**.’¹³⁷ In later books *mānasā* is indeed modified by other *-āñc-* stem adjectives, *devadr̥cā́* and *satr̥cā́*.¹³⁸ On each occasion it is to be taken as an instrumental of manner, prescribing a proper sacrificial mindset. Whereas *devadr̥cā́* and *satr̥cā́* always directly precede *mānasā*, *prācā́* and *nīcā́* directly precede the verb and/or occupy the initial position of the pāda, as is characteristic of adverbs.

- (87) *yáḥ agníṣómā haviṣā saparyāt*
devadr̥cā́ mānasā́ yáḥ ghy̐tēna (I.93.8ab)

‘Whoever will serve Agni and Soma with an oblation, **with a mind turned towards the gods**, with ghee’

- (88) *prā́ yáḥ satr̥cā́ mānasā́ yájāte*
etāvāntam nāryam āvívāsāt (VII.100.1cd)

‘[the mortal] will set the sacrifice in motion **with fully focussed mind**, and will seek to attract here such a one, favorable to men.’

¹³⁶ Lanman (1880: 457) and Thomson (1891: 31) also argue for an adverbial treatment of *prācā́* in III.31.5.

¹³⁷ There are parallels for an independent *mānasā* ‘with the mind’ used as an inst. of means, e.g. in I.20.2, where it contrasts with *āsayá* ‘by mouth’ in the previous verse. See Jamison (comm. I.20.2).

¹³⁸ *devadr̥cā́ mānasā́* is found in I.93.8, I.163.12; *satr̥cā́ mānasā́* in VII.100.1, VIII.2.37, IX.77.4.

Aside from *devadr̥cā* and *satr̥cā*, the only additional instrumental case-forms of productive -*añc-* stems in the RV are m. sg. *uruvyácā* (with *varimatā*, I.108.2) and *arvácā* (with *rathena*, VII.78.1).¹³⁹ It is extremely common for case-forms of -*añc-* stems to be used adverbially, but an overwhelming majority of the time it is the neuter accusative singular that supplies this function, rather than the instrumental. In the family books are found *arvák* (40×, II+), *viṣvak* (14×, III+), *sadhriak* (8×, II+), *asmadriak* (8×, III+), *prák* (6×, III+), *ápāk* (5×, III+), *samyák* (5×, IV+), *údak* (4×, III+), *madriak* (2×, III+), and *viṣvadriak* (VII.25.1). Later are found also *niak* (9×, VIII+)¹⁴⁰, *akudhriak* (X.22.12), and *pratyák* (X.87.15). Both *prāñc-* and *nīañc-* are used adverbially in both the instrumental singular (*prācā́*, *nīcā́*) and the neuter accusative singular (*prák*, *niak*). The accusative adverbs *prák* and *niak* generally appear later than their instrumental counterparts: *prák* appears only once in the family books, and *niak* is not used before book VIII. They also show a decided tendency to appear alongside other n. acc. sg. -*añc-* stems in sequences of directional adverbs, which impart a sense of omni-directionality to the verbal action. Neither *prācā́* nor *nīcā́* occurs in this type of sequence, but they are otherwise functionally and semantically equivalent to their neuter singular accusative counterparts.

(89) *rājā vṛtrám jaṅghanat prák ápāk údak*
áthā yajāte vāre á pṛthivyāḥ (III.53.11cd)

‘The king will smash the obstacle **to the east**, to the west, to the north. Then he will sacrifice on the best part of the earth.’

(90) *yāt indra prák ápāk údak*
nyák vā hūyāse nṛbhiḥ (VIII.4.1ab)

‘When, Indra, you are being called **forward** or back, up or **down**, by men,’

¹³⁹ Dunkel (2000: 20) takes *arvácā* in VII.78.1 as an adverb, but to my knowledge he is alone in doing so. The inst. sg. appears only once in the RV, and Grassmann, Geldner, J&B, and others take it to modify *rathena* in the same pāda. In contrast, the n. sg. acc. *arvák* (39×, II+) is common in adverbial use from an early period.

¹⁴⁰ Three of the nine appearances of *niak* occur in X.60.11, together with *nīcīnam*.

4.2.3 Accentual remodeling in *-āñc-* stems

Kuryłowicz (1935: 157) suggests that *nīcā́* and *prācā́* are old instrumentals from *-āñc-* stems that originally had mobile accent, and that they were retained as adverbs with fossilized accent after the productive paradigms were accentually leveled. In my view Kuryłowicz often shows an overwillingness to declare any purported case of ‘adverbial accent shift’ a retention from an older stage of the language, whether or not there is any evidence of diachronic accent remodeling. In this case, however, I find his suggestion plausible, because a number of *-āñc-* stems demonstrably undergo paradigmatic and/or analogical leveling at some point in their development. In later Vedic texts, accentually mobile paradigms in original $^{\circ}y\text{-}\acute{a}\acute{n}\acute{c}\text{-}/^{\circ}\bar{i}\acute{c}\text{-}$ and $^{\circ}v\text{-}\acute{a}\acute{n}\acute{c}\text{-}/^{\circ}\bar{u}\acute{c}\text{-}$ show evidence of leveling in favor of fixed stem accent. Thus *prā́ñc-* AV+, *anū́c-* AV+, *samī́c-* TS, *dadhī́c-* BR replace corresponding Ṛgvedic weak stems with ending accent. The effects of this leveling can be seen already in the Ṛgveda. F. acc. sg. *prā́ñcīm* in X.18.14¹⁴¹ contrasts accentually with a weak stem and feminine derivative in $^{\circ}\bar{i}\acute{c}\text{-}$, making a minimal pair with f. acc. sg. *prā́ñcīm* in V.12.1. Wackernagel-Debrunner contend that the spread of fixed accent probably comes about due to the fact that the difference in sound between *-yāñc-* and *-yāñc-* disappeared in the late-Vedic period.¹⁴²

The evidence is clear that this transition affected $^{\circ}y\text{-}\acute{a}\acute{n}\acute{c}$ and $^{\circ}v\text{-}\acute{a}\acute{n}\acute{c}$ stems in late Vedic. Kuryłowicz argues that an earlier transition from mobile to fixed accent had already affected $^{\circ}\acute{a}\acute{n}\acute{c}\text{-}/^{\circ}\acute{a}\acute{c}$ stems by the time of the Ṛgveda. Kuryłowicz (1935: 157) regards accentual mobility as the original state of affairs not only for $^{\circ}y\text{-}\acute{a}\acute{n}\acute{c}$ and $^{\circ}v\text{-}\acute{a}\acute{n}\acute{c}$ stems, but for the entire *-āñc-* class. He identifies ambiguously contracted stems, specifically *prā́ñc-*, as the starting point of a systematic

¹⁴¹ Lanman (1880: 455) argues that the accent of *prā́ñcīm* is one of several factors that show RV X.18.14 to be a later addition. The usual accent contrast between *āñc-* stems in the Ṛgveda and later texts is shown by *jahí prā́ñcō anū́cāḥ* (RV III.30.6) next to *jahí prā́ñcō anū́cāḥ* (AV III.1.4).

¹⁴² AiG III 18f.

change from mobile to fixed accent. Following contraction, the underlying accent of *prāñc-* is ambiguous. It could be interpreted either as *pra-áñc-*, with stem-final accent, or as *prá-añc-*, maintaining the ‘initial’ accent of the base *prá*. The accentual variation seen among the weak cases of *prāñc-* in the RV lends credence to the theory that a reanalysis of the stem has taken place diachronically. Inst. sg. *prācā́* reflects the older stage, when the underlying stem was perceived to have stem-final accent on *-áñc-*. A ‘shift’ of accent to an oblique case ending plays out as a regular case of accent mobility, which is expected of a stem of this shape. On the other hand, the fixed barytone accent of other weak case-forms like loc sg. *prāci*, acc. pl. *prācas* reflects a stem *prá-añc-*, with a fixed accent on the initial preverb base. Fossilized as an adverb, *prācā́* is no longer considered part of the productive *prāñc-* paradigm when the accentual reinterpretation of the stem takes place.

Other *-añc-* stems with fixed accent are seen as either remodeled by proportional analogy, or new creations after a general transition from mobile to fixed accent has been implemented on a wider scale. For example, *prá : prá-a(ñ)c- :: ápa : x* produces an initially accented stem *ápā(ñ)c-*, which according to Kuryłowicz replaces an earlier **apā(ñ)c-*. By the same process, the stem *nía(ñ)c-* would replace an earlier **nyañc-*, of which only the inst. *nīcā́* remains as a fossilized adverbial case-form. Not all stems are affected regularly, and apart from *níañc-* those in *°yañc-* and *°váñc-* are (at first) particularly resistant to the change. With a monosyllabic preverb in final short semivowel as its base, the most directly comparable stem to *ní-añc* is *sv-áñc-*. The latter is accented not on *sú* but on *-áñc-*, like the majority of stems from bases in final *ĩ* or *ũ*. This is the case even when *-añc-* is added to a multisyllabic base in *ĩ/ũ* that is accented on the initial syllable, e.g. *prāti* → *praty-áñc-*, *ánu* → *anv-áñc-*. *níañc-* is not alone in deviating from this pattern, but all other stems in *-íañc-* (rather than *-yañc-*) contain the extra *-dhri-* or *-dri-*

element that traces to model stems *sadhria(ñ)c-* and *asmadria(ñ)c-*. In a sense, the initial accent of the synchronic paradigm is more unexpected than the ‘adverbial’ ending-accent of *nīcā́*.

In the post-Ṛgvedic period *nīcā́* and *nīcā* (ŚB, TS) co-occur, without apparent functional distinction. This presents no difficulty for Kuryłowicz’ scenario. Adverbial *nīcā́* originates as an ordinary instrumental, whose accentual irregularity with respect to the synchronic paradigm results from *retention* rather than from ‘adverbial accent shift.’ This being the case, theoretically nothing prevents the synchronically regular instrumental from developing the same adverbial function, without any expectation that it should undergo a shift of accent to mark it as such.

4.2.4 Adverbs in *-cā́, -cāt, -caís*

nīcā́ and *prācā́* are related, at least superficially, to three additional adverbs in Ved. °*cā́* (= YAv. °*ča*). It is unclear whether they share common morphology or merely acquire a later association through reanalysis and analogy.

(91) ISOLATED ADVERBS IN INST. °*cā́*

uccā́ ‘high above’ 12×, II+ (: *úd*), cf. YAv. *usča* ‘above,’ *uskāt* ‘from up high’
tiraścā́ ‘across’ 3×, II+ (: *tirás*), cf. YAv. *tarasča* ‘through, across’
paścā́ ‘behind, later’ 8×, II+ (: **pos*), cf. YAv. *pasča* ‘after,’ *paskāt* ‘from behind’

Lanman (1880: 337, 457) incorrectly theorizes that all three of these adverbs are instrumental case-forms of *-añc-* stems, parallel in construction to *nīcā́* and *prācā́* and similarly affected by adverbial accent shift. Thus *paścā́* < **pás-(a)c-ā*, *tiraścā́* < **tirás-(a)c-ā* and *uccā́* < **úd-(a)c-ā*. There are no attested forms of an underlying or backformed stem *pásañc-** beside adverbial *paścā́*. Nor are there other Ṛgvedic case-forms in *tiraśc-*, though it does form the base of derivatives *tiraścātā* ‘across’ 2×, IV+, *tiraścīna-* ‘horizontal’ X.129.5, and a P.N. *tiraścī-* VIII.95.4. Loc. *tiraścī* (AV) and f. *tiraścī-* (AV+) are later developments which demonstrate that,

at this later date, *tiraśc-á* was synchronically perceived as the instrumental of an *-añc-* paradigm. New case-forms could then be built to the ‘weak stem’ backformed from the *-cá* adverb. An innovated stem *tir-y-áñc-* AV+¹⁴³ supplies the strong stem next to weak stem *tiraśc-’* in a post-RV suppletive paradigm. The suppletive relationship between *tiraśc-* and relatively late *tiryáñc-* is transparent, due to the readily apparent differences between the stems *tir-y-* and *tiras-*. It is more difficult to identify the nature of the relationship between *údañc-* and adverbial *uccá*. Of Lanman’s three projected *-añc-* stems, only *údañc-* is directly attested. A post-RV weak stem *údīc-* (AV+, cf. YAv. *usīanč-*) is introduced into the paradigm of *údañc-* by analogy to its antonym, *níañc-* : *nīc-*.¹⁴⁴ If *uccá* is the original instrumental of *údañc-*, the innovation of a new weak stem could indicate that *uccá* was retained as an adverb after it was synchronically dissociated from its original *-añc-* paradigm, leaving a gap in the paradigm for *údīc-* to fill. The neuter singular accusative *údak* ‘above’ (4×, III+) is synonymous with *uccá*, also functioning as the adverb of *údañc-*. The redundancy of *uccá* and *údak*, together with the synchronic opacity of their relationship, seems to me further evidence that they were not connected in the minds of speakers as part of the same paradigm. It is true that *uc-c-* ← *úd* looks unlike any other weak *-añc-* stem. The majority of *-añc-* stems are formed from bases that end in vowels and semi-vowels, which yield weak stems in recognizably parallel *°āc-*, *°īc-*, *°ūc-*.¹⁴⁵ If they are indeed fossilized instrumental *-añc-* stems in origin, consonant-final bases distinguish *uccá* ← *úd*, *tiraścá* ← *tiráś* and *paścá* ← **pos* from all others. The resulting sandhi effects in the zero-grade

¹⁴³ The *y* of *tiryáñc-* is probably inserted after analogy to *pratyáñc-* (AiG II/2 153). Dunkel (2000: 24) rightly criticizes Grassmann and Mayrhofer (EWA I 646) for providing no independent entry for *tiraśc-*, but instead listing *tiraścá* under *tir-y-áñc-*, the suppletive ‘strong stem’ that does not first appear before the AV.

¹⁴⁴ AiG II/2 153; EWA I 215. *údīc-* results from the analogy *ní-añc-* : *nīc-* :: *úd-añc-* : *x*, where *nīc-* < **(e)ni-h₃k^h*- can be reanalyzed as *ní + īc-*.

¹⁴⁵ *samyáñc-*, *samīc-* is the only near-exception, but it is not formed directly from the adverb *sám*. The inserted *y* shows it to be formed after the model of *pratyáñc-*.

are trivial in the case of *tiraś-c-* and *paś-c-*, but *úd* is subject to sandhi that renders the derivation opaque.

It is also possible that the similarity between *údañc-* and adverbial *uccā́* is largely coincidental, and that *paścā́*, *tiraścā́*, and *uccā́* all derive from a source other than *-añc-* stems. Lanman's explanation is accepted by Delbrück (1888a: 139, fn. 1) and Whitney (§1112e, p. 362), but rejected by others and replaced with diverse alternatives. Wackernagel-Debrunner, for instance, analyze *paścā́*, *uccā́* and *tiraścā́* as instrumentals of underlying stems in a thematic formant *-ca-*.¹⁴⁶ Next to *paścā́* and *uccā́*, there are unambiguously thematic adverbs *paścāt́* 'from behind' (YAv. *paskāt́*) and *uccaís* 'high above, upwards' (cf. YAv. abl. *uskāt́*).¹⁴⁷ Due to potential homophony between the *-ā* instrumentals of thematic *-ca-* stems and zero-grade athematic *-añc-* stems (e.g. *paścā́* < **paścā-ā* or **paś-c-ā́*), there appears to have been reanalysis and intermixing between the two types. Next to *nīcā́* and *prācā́* are thematic abl. sg. *nīcāt́*, 'from below' I.116.22, inst. pl. *nīcaís* 'downward' AV+,¹⁴⁸ and *prācaís* 'forward' I.83.2 which reflect oxytone thematic stems *nīcā-* and *prācā-*.¹⁴⁹ Wackernagel-Debrunner take these to be analogical creations after the model of thematic *paścā́*, et al.

(92) ANALOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THEMATIC ADVERBS

<i>paścā́</i> 7×, II+	:	<i>paścāt́</i> 17×, II+	::	<i>nīcā́</i> 7×, II+	:	<i>nīcāt́</i> I.116.22
<i>uccā́</i> 12×, II+	:	<i>uccaís</i> V.32.6	::	<i>nīcā́</i> 7×, II+	:	<i>nīcaís</i> AV+
				<i>prācā́</i> 3×, III+	:	<i>prācaís</i> I.83.2

¹⁴⁶ AiG II/2 545f, III 231.

¹⁴⁷ Stem leveling has generalized the palatal consonant in Ved. abl. *paścāt́*, *nīcāt́*, etc. which is historically the wrong outcome. YAv. *paścā~paskāt́* and *uscā~uskāt́* show the original variation between *c* and *k*, which is conditioned by the vowel of the ending (AiG II/2 546).

¹⁴⁸ The inst. pl. use as an adverb is a late development, just beginning to take hold in the RV. None of the adverbial inst. pl. forms has the ending *-ebhis*; they are uniformly in thematic *-aís*. The adverb *śanakaís* 'slowly,' common in Classical Sanskrit, only appears once in RV VIII.80.3.

¹⁴⁹ There is also a thematic adverb *parācaís* 'far away' 6×, VI+, apparently from *parācā-*. No inst. adv. *parācā́** exists in the RV alongside *nīcā́* and *prācā́*, but YAv. inst. sg. *parācā́* 'forth, away' (: *parānk-*) suggests the possible inheritance of this form from IIr.

The innovation of thematic forms during and after the RV period does suggest that *nīcā́* and *prācā́* were synchronically regarded as thematic forms, and not as instrumentals of *-añc-* paradigms.¹⁵⁰ This being the case, there is slim chance that they would have been synchronically recognized as examples of ‘adverbial accent shift.’ It is even possible that adverbial *nīcā́* and *prācā́* were originally thematic *-ā* instrumentals, parallel in construction to the *paścā́* type, as long as *-cā-* is traced to a root such as **-h₃k^u-* ‘eye’ to account for the lengthened stem vowels. They would inherit their oxytone accent from the underlying stem. Their homophony to the instrumentals of *nīañc-* and *prāñc-* in all but accent could easily lead to reanalysis and a partial collapse of the two paradigms, leaving the reason for the descriptive ‘accent shift’ synchronically opaque.¹⁵¹ However, it does seem that athematic *nīcā́* and *prācā́* are the original models from which thematic stems were back-formed. The timeline favors the analogical scenario: there is ample evidence for an old thematic *paścāt* (YAv. *paskā́t*) and *uccā́s* in RV book V has a thematic parallel in YAv. *uskā́t*, but there is no such clear evidence for *nīcā́-* and *prācā́-*, which are comparatively late and rare. Even if they are not parallel in formation to other Vedic adverbs in *°cā́*, the surface homophony of *nīcā́* and *prācā́* with the established *paścā́*-type could certainly encourage their retention as adverbs with fossilized ending-accent.

Alternatively, *paścā́*, *uccā́* and *tiraścā́* could have served as analogical models for the accent of *nīcā́** and *prācā́**, the synchronically regular instrumentals of *nīañc-* and *prāñc-*, to be drawn to the ending secondarily. This could technically be considered ‘adverbial accent shift,’ but as in the case of *patayát* (see §2.3) the scope of the claim would be significantly reduced. By naming specific analogical models, we need not posit an independent accentual process that

¹⁵⁰ Lanman (1880: 457) points out the likelihood that these forms would be synchronically (re-)analyzed as thematic.

¹⁵¹ See Thumb (1905: 219f.) and references therein.

intermittently targets adverbs. Dunkel (2000: 20) believes there is analogical influence at play between $-c\acute{a}$ adverbs and $-a(\tilde{n})c-$ stems, but in his view it works in the opposite direction. Dunkel traces the adverbial suffix $-c\acute{a}$ to $*(-s)-k^ue$, to be compared with Lat. *absque, susque, usque*. Therefore he reconstructs $pa\acute{s}c\acute{a} < *p\acute{o}-sk^ue$, $tira\acute{s}c\acute{a} < *t\acute{r}h_2m-sk^ue$, $ucc\acute{a} < *u\acute{d}-k^ue$ (with an *s*-less variant of the ending, in contrast to Av. *usča < *u\acute{d}-sk^ue*). To this group he adds Ved. *ácchā* ‘to, towards’ $< *ad-sk^ue$. This reconstruction yields a short, unaccented final vowel, which he posits is remodelled through analogy to pre-existing $n\acute{r}c\acute{a}$ and $pr\acute{a}c\acute{a}$ —which he assumes to be the products of adverbial accent shift.

I consider the paradigms in $-(y)a\tilde{n}c-$ and $-(i):c-$ to be crucial indeed for the understanding of $ucc\acute{a}$, $pa\acute{s}c\acute{a}$ and $tira\acute{s}c\acute{a}$ —not as their historical source, but rather as analogical models. The expected ‘*úcca*’ and ‘*usca*’ were remodelled to match the adverbial instrumentals in $-\bar{a}c-\acute{a}$, $-\bar{i}c-\acute{a}$, $-\acute{i}c-\acute{a}$ —or we could speak of resegmentation and generalisation of $-c\acute{a}$ into post-consonantal position.

Dunkel’s account is not without problems. He offers three examples of adverbial instrumentals from $-(y)a\tilde{n}c-$ stems, which supposedly served as analogical models for $pa\acute{s}c\acute{a}$, et al. One of these is $arv\acute{a}c\bar{a}$, which is almost certainly not an adverb (see fn. 139) and regardless has the wrong accent to model final accented $^{\circ}c\acute{a}$. The other two are $n\acute{r}c\acute{a}$ and $pr\acute{a}c\acute{a}$, which of course have problematic accent that does not align with the rest of their respective paradigms; it is thus difficult to take them for granted as models to explain other irregularities. There is also no reason to assume that $n\acute{r}c\acute{a}$, which lacks an adverbial parallel in Avestan (though YAv. *niiānč-* is attested) predates the demonstrably old $ucc\acute{a}$, $pa\acute{s}c\acute{a}$, $tira\acute{s}c\acute{a}$ type. Further, Dunkel argues that ‘irregular laryngeal loss’ in $uc-c\acute{a} < *(H)ud-h_3k^ue-éh_1$ is undesirable because it requires ‘special

pleading,’ but it is no more desperate than his *ad hoc* reliance on an s-less variant of *-sk^u-e in order to justify *úsca* > *uccá*.¹⁵²

At this point, there are few definitive answers to be found when it comes to the origin of -*añc*- stems and -*cá* adverbs. Certainly nothing demands an analysis that includes adverbial accent shift, save explanatory convenience. What is clear is that *nīcá* and *prācá* were open to synchronic reanalysis as thematic instrumentals, which is consistent with Kuryłowicz’ theory that they are fossilized retentions whose accent is historically regular. As retentions, they are not the products of ‘adverbial accent shift’ in origin, and as synchronic thematic stems they would not contribute to a perception that such a process is synchronically productive.

4.3 Conclusion

I have argued that *nīcá* and *prācá* are fossilized retentions rather than distinguished from their synchronic -*añc*- paradigms by an adverbial shift of accent. Similarly, adverbial *apākā/-át* and *upāké* retain the underlying oxytone accent of the locative °*Vká*- type, and it is the corresponding barytone forms that require additional explanation. These cases highlight the fact that notions of ‘underlying’ stem accent are subject to analysis, and adverbial accent shift is ultimately purely descriptive.

Rarely is the possibility of genuine historical retention (as a source of synchronic exceptions) so recklessly dismissed as in the case of so-called ‘adverbial accent shift.’ Accentual evidence is disregarded all too often whenever adverbs are involved, because adverbial accent shift is generally assumed to be pervasive in the language, and yet also random. Its open-endedness renders all manner of analyses exempt from accountability for their accent, and leaves few tools for evaluating which is the more plausible scenario. But in most cases it is possible to

¹⁵² See Kuiper (1947: 206f.) on laryngeal loss between consonants, which mainly occurs between dentals and nasals.

take the accent of adverbial case-forms as genuine and diagnostic. All things being equal, for the sake of economy an explanation that does not require that we add an abstract productive process of ‘adverbial accent shift’ in the Vedic grammar is preferable to one that does.

CHAPTER 5

‘ACCENT-SHIFTED’ ADVERBS FROM THEMATIC CASE-FORMS

Even if we eliminate *apāká/-át* and *upāké* as well as adverbs in *-a-yá* and *-tarám* from consideration, there still remains a substantial group of thematic case-forms with descriptively irregular accent that is generally thought to result from ‘adverbial accent shift.’¹⁵³ A significant proportion of these adverbial forms end in *-á*. I am inclined to suspect that descriptive adverbial accent shift in thematic case-forms is originally associated with an adverbial suffix *-á*, rather than motivated by an ill-defined [+adverb] feature. From forms in final accented *-á*, ‘accent shift’ spreads to adverbial forms in other case endings through a series of analogical relationships.

In §5.1, I critique Delbrück’s theory that fossilized accent in a few adverbial case-forms is reanalyzed as a productive ‘accent shift’ process and subsequently applied to non-ablating forms. In §5.2, I examine the distribution of accent-shifted adverbs from thematic stems, noting that they are restricted to adjectives of direction and also the prevalence of forms in final *-á*. In §5.3, I survey the purported examples of adverbial accent shift in *-á* individually, comparing them with barytone counterparts where applicable. In §5.4, I speculate as to the possible origins of an adverbial suffix *-á* that could be responsible, through analogy, for the propagation of thematic case-forms with apparent shift of accent. Propagation through analogy also explains the restriction of accent-shifted forms in this category to stems with directive/locative semantics. In §5.5, I employ a modified version of Delbrück’s theory to explain the remaining temporal adverbs, which are indisputably regular thematic case-forms and lack obvious models in *-á*. I conclude in §5.6 that there is no reason to believe that the descriptive accent shift in adverbial

¹⁵³ In the previous chapter it was argued that these adverb types should not be considered genuine thematic case-forms with a secondary shift of accent, because they are formed with derivational suffixes rather than with ‘adverbial accent shift’ applied to adjectival case endings.

case-forms of thematic adjectives relates to the varieties of ‘accent shift’ that are observed in morphologically unrelated adverbs throughout the language.

5.1 Background and distribution

We have seen in the previous chapter that some adverbs with the synchronic appearance of accent shift, for example *nīc-ā́* (: *nīañc-*) and *prāc-ā́* (: *prāñc-*), are better regarded as old inherited case-forms. Fossilized in adverbial use, they maintain the original accent of their paradigms prior to accentual remodeling. According to Delbrück (1893: 541ff.), synchronically opaque cases such as this create the illusion of ‘adverbial accent shift.’ The accentual distinction is reanalyzed as productive oxytonesis to mark adverbial use, which can then be applied even to adverbs from non-ablauting stems that were never oxytone in the first place. Kuryłowicz (1952: 21f.) clarifies, “Nous n’affirmons pas que toutes ces formes soient d’anciens cas figés. Ce n’est que l’opposition entre la barytonèse (due au recul d’accent) des formes casuelles et l’oxytonèse des adverbes correspondants qui paraît ancienne.” Where apparent ‘accent shift’ results from retention rather than innovation, Delbrück points out that the adverbial accent should be regarded merely as ‘different’ from that of the adjective, rather than ‘changed’—a crucial distinction in wording, which the literature surrounding this topic fails to make on a regular basis.¹⁵⁴

I am sympathetic to Delbrück’s line of reasoning, which is tentatively endorsed by Wackernagel-Debrunner,¹⁵⁵ because he attempts to provide historical context for adverbial accent shift. But it requires further explanation and certain restrictions, at the very least. Although he may be correct on certain points, Delbrück’s abstract account offers few practical details. He

¹⁵⁴ In this, Delbrück (1893: 543) corrects his earlier phrasing: “Ich hätte [in (1888: 139)] deshalb...nicht von einer ‘Veränderung’, sondern von einer ‘Verschiedenheit’ des Accentus reden sollen.”

¹⁵⁵ AiG II/1 21. Wackernagel-Debrunner (AiG III 87) later observe, “In mehreren Sprachen ist Oxytonese ein Formales Kennzeichen des Adverbs barytoner Adjektiva geworden, weil die den Adverbien zugrunde liegenden Kasus (Lok., Abl., Instr.) einst Endungsbetonung hatten,” with examples *dakṣiṇā́/-é* (: *dákṣiṇa-*), *uttarā́/-āt* (: *úttara-*), and *sanā́t* (: *sána-*).

seems to suggest that a new accentual rule is added to the grammar, by which any adverbial case-form may be marked as such overtly by a secondary shift of accent. But precisely which forms could conceivably model the new, productive accentual process is a thorny issue. I argued in the previous chapter that the accent of *nīcā́* and *prācā́*, *upāké* and *apākā́/-āt* results from retention rather than innovation, but I think it unlikely that any of these forms provided a template of ‘adverbial accent shift’ that other adverbial case-forms to emulate: (a) *nīcā́* and *prācā́* are synchronically case-forms of oxytone thematic stems *nīcá-* and *prācá-*, not instrumentals of *-ańc-* stems,¹⁵⁶ (b) adverbial *upāké* is not accentually distinct from adnominal *upākáyos*, and (c) *apākā́* and *apākā́t* appear to be morphologically unrelated to barytone *á-pāka-*, even synchronically. It is an uphill battle to claim that any of these forms established a pattern of barytone adnominal → oxytone adverb that was re-analyzable as productive ‘accent shift.’ Meanwhile accented *-vát*, *-ayá*, and *-tarám* synchronically operate as productive adverbial suffixes throughout all stages of the language. The accent shift in participial *patayát* does seem to be modeled after the apparent shift in *dráv-a(n)t-* : *drav-át*, but it is difficult to see why this set of forms should induce adverbial accent shift elsewhere, especially since not even other *nt-* participles are affected.

Delbrück’s explanation also fails to explain the distribution of case-forms with adverbial accent shift, either throughout the language as a whole or specifically among thematic stems. It is common practice to treat all examples of ‘adverbial accent shift’ as part of the same process. As a result, it is rarely (if ever) observed that there are semantic restrictions within certain subgroups. Among thematic stems, adverbial accent shift is only found in the adverbial case

¹⁵⁶ *pace* Kuryłowicz (1952: 21f.), who agrees that *prācā́* is a retention but believes that it could have served as a model for the extension of adverbial accent shift to other adverbs.

forms of adjectives of direction. The following is a comprehensive list of all remaining ‘accent-shifted’ adverbs from thematic stems.¹⁵⁷

(93) THEMATIC CASE-FORMS WITH ‘ADVERBIAL ACCENT SHIFT’

- adharā́*- ‘downward’ (: *ádhara*- ‘below’)¹⁵⁸
adharā́t ‘from below’ 9×, VI+ (: *ádhara*- ‘below’)
aparám ‘in the future’ 7×, II+ (: *ápara*- ‘hinder, later’)
 -*áya* ‘for the future’ VI.33.5
amā́ ‘at home’ 9×, II+ (: AV *áma*- ‘this, here’)
 -*āt* ‘from nearby’ V.53.8, IX.97.8
uttarā́t ‘from above’ 4×, VI+ (: *úttara*- ‘above’)
ubhayā́ ‘on both sides; in both ways’ X.108.6 (: *ubháya*- ‘both’)
dakṣiṇā́ ‘to the right; in the south’ II.27.11, X.17.9 (: *dákṣiṇa*- ‘right, southern’)
 -*é* ‘in the right (hand)’ I.100.9
paré ‘in the future’ VIII.61.17 (: *pára*- ‘distant, further’)
madhyā́ ‘in the middle (of)’ 4×, II+ (: *mádhya*-, adj./n. ‘middle’)
sanā́t ‘from of old, always’ 21×, II+ (: *sána*- ‘old, ancient’)
samanā́ ‘together, as one, evenly’ 13×, II+ (: *sámana*- ‘together’, n. ‘meeting place’)

To my knowledge, adverbial case-forms with ‘accent shift’ from thematic stems universally express direction or relative location in space or time. Even *samanā́* ‘together’ expresses a proximity relationship. There is nothing inherent about accent shift that should dictate this restriction, if it is deemed to be an accentual process that (optionally) affects adverbial case-forms throughout the language. The same restriction does not necessarily apply to purported cases of accent shift outside of thematic stems. In noting simply that there is an overall tendency for adverbs of direction to undergo accent shift, the literature fails to acknowledge that different

¹⁵⁷ Thematic case forms *apākā́*, -*āt* and *upāké* are almost always listed alongside the forms under (§93) as further examples of adverbial accent shift, but I have already discounted that analysis in §4.1. I have also omitted forms in -*yā́* and -*tarám*, which are no longer regarded as ordinary thematic case-forms. *ubhayā́* and *madhyā́* are included, however, because their analysis is ambiguous: they may be haplologized forms in original *°yayā́* (see §3.1), or alternatively they may belong in this group as simple instrumentals in -*ā́*. Although I lean toward the former hypothesis, I will also explore the latter possibility in this chapter.

¹⁵⁸ An adverb *adharā́* ‘downward’ is the base of *adharā́ñc-* ‘heading downward’ (2×, X) and *adharā́cīna-* ‘heading downward’ II.17.5. See AiG III 19 and §5.3.3 below.

morphological categories have different semantic criteria for determining which adverbial case-forms are eligible for accent shift.

Considering the limited number of forms under (§93) and their shared features, I think it highly questionable that ‘adverbial accent shift’ operated on the abstract level that Delbrück suggests. ‘Adverbial accent shift’ appears to affect only morphologically isolatable subgroups, and the forms in any given subgroup share morphological and semantic features. This creates an ideal scenario for a property like ‘accent shift’ to spread by analogy on a word-by-word basis, rather than on the basis of an ill-defined abstract property [+adverb]. I have already repeatedly argued along these lines regarding forms in *-vát*, participial *-át*, *°ayá/°uyá*, *-tarām*, and to a certain extent *°cā* in previous chapters. Instead of taking a top-down approach that assumes a global connection between accentually irregular adverbs based on their syntactic function, once again I prefer to seek a reason for the apparent shift of accent in the formal and semantic properties of the adverbs themselves.

5.2 Prevalence of instrumental *-ā*

Aside from the semantic restriction to directive/locative stems, one further general observation can be made about ‘accent-shifted’ adverbs from thematic stems, if they are considered in isolation rather than assumed *a priori* to represent the same accent shift process as morphologically unrelated forms ranging from *ṅvát* to *gúhā*. The forms show a decided tendency to end in *-ā*, and to a lesser extent ablative *-āt*, with only a few outliers. At the same time, multiple ‘accent-shifted’ thematic adverbs in endings other than *-ā* coexist with forms in *-ā* from the same stem. For example, dative *dakṣiṇé* and ablative *amāt* stand next to *dakṣiṇ-ā* and *am-ā*, respectively. There is likewise evidence of adverbs *adharā* that could very well pre-date *adharāt* and its antonym *uttarāt*. Based on the prevalence of *-ā* in the forms under (§93), and the

points of connection between forms in *-ā́* and the others in the list, it is easy to imagine that an accented *-ā́* suffix holds the key to explaining the ‘accent shift’ in the group as a whole.

One might argue that it is only natural for accent-shifted instrumentals to outnumber accent-shifted adverbs in other grammatical cases because, generally speaking, adverbial case-forms are particularly common in the instrumental. I see two problems with this assumption. Firstly, under ordinary circumstances adverbial case-forms are more frequent in the accusative than in the instrumental.¹⁵⁹ The fact that instrumentals by far outnumber accusatives, if *-vát* and *-tarám* are discounted, suggests to me that there is something particular about the form of the instrumental that encourages accent shift. Secondly, it is not merely case that is significant. Although adverbial case-forms with ‘accent shift’ are quite numerous in the instrumental, there is not a single purported case with instrumentals in *-ena* or *-bhis*. Such case-forms are capable of functioning adverbially in the RV and later, e.g. *aktúbhis* ‘by night’ (8×, III+), *táviṣṭbhis* ‘with might’ (4×, II+), and *dákṣiṇena* ‘southward, on the right’ (ŚB+), *úttareṇa* ‘northward; on the left (of)’ (KŚ, ŚB+), *ágreṇa* ‘in front’ (ŚB+).

Lanman (1880: 358) reasons, “[t]he adverbial shifting of accent is natural in the homophonous instrumentals, since it differentiates them from the nominatives of the same form,” citing *dakṣiṇā́*, *samanā́*, *madhyā́* and *ubhayā́* as feminine instrumentals that correspond with nominatives in *-ā́*.¹⁶⁰ At first glance, his observation might seem to explain the relative frequency of ‘accent-shifted’ adverbs in instrumental *-ā́*, but a number of counter-arguments can be raised. If formal differentiation from the nominative motivates accent shift in these forms, why should it

¹⁵⁹ MacDonnell (1910: 427). Among adverbial case-forms with accent shift, the accusative is more common than the instrumental only if we count individual adverbs in productive *-vát* and *-tarám* as distinct instances of accent shift. Even those who believe that accent shift has affected *-vát* and *-tarám* generally accept that the shift occurred at an early stage, producing accented suffixes.

¹⁶⁰ Lanman also includes *naktayā́* and *svapnayā́* as homophonous instrumentals, adding that *ṛtayā́* is possibly another example if it derives from a feminine *ayā́*-stem and not *ṛtā́*. *madhyā́* and *ubhayā́* are quite possibly better analyzed as haplogitized adverbs in original *°yayā́* (see §3.1), but synchronically they do fit in among the adverbs of direction/location under (§93) in terms of both form and function.

specifically target adverbial instrumentals, as opposed to any feminine instrumental in *-ā*? Of course, Lanman assumes that adverbial accent shift is productive in Vedic, and he merely seeks to justify its selective application in these particular cases. Yet, he offers no similar justification for any other purported instance of adverbial accent shift. I see no reason to think that the form of the nominative comes into play, when the accent crucially distinguishes the adverbial instrumental from the regular instrumental in non-adverbial use.

There is also the fact that the RV favors the neuter over the feminine for adverbial case-forms of adjective stems, regardless of accent.¹⁶¹ If they are indeed feminine forms, instrumentals in *-ā́* would constitute the single largest exception to this generalization. All non-instrumental adverbial case-forms with ‘accent shift’ are neuter, once those in *-tarā́m* are discounted as a later development and those in *-ayā́* are identified as something else entirely. Thus, in the list under (§93) we find n. loc. *dakṣiṇé* (not f. loc. *-āyām*), n. abl. *sanāt* (not f. abl. *-āyās*), n. acc. *aparām* and dat. *aparā́ya* (not f. acc. *-ām* or dat. *-āyai*).

At the same time, I must allow that thematic *-ā* instrumentals are not exclusively feminine in the RV. Although *-ena* has replaced *-ā* as the normal thematic instrumental ending for *a*-stems, just over a dozen masculine and neuter *a*-stems do use the instrumental *-ā* ending, but these are typically nominal, not adjectival.¹⁶² Moreover, adverbial case-forms in *-ā́* from thematic stems are isolated within their paradigms in a way that adverbial case-forms in other thematic endings are not. Accentual minimal pairs between adverbial case-forms with accent

¹⁶¹ Whitney (§1111, p.361f.) observes that adverbial case-forms are most commonly neuter singular, but sometimes feminine singular as well. His primary examples of this are the adverbial suffixes *-tarām* and *-tamām* (see §3.2.2), but “[i]n the oldest language (RV and AV), the neuter instead of the feminine form of these suffixes is almost alone in use.” It has been claimed that adverbs in *-ayā́* are feminine instrumentals, but see §3.1 for the counter-arguments.

¹⁶² MacDonnell (1910: 257): “In the m. there are no quite certain examples beyond *yajñā́*; possibly also *krāñā́* ‘acting’, *ghanā́* ‘club’, *dānā́* ‘gift’, *camasā́* ‘cup’. The n. forms are *kavitvā́* and *kavitvanā́* ‘by wisdom’, *tarañitvā́* ‘by energy’, *mahitvā́* and *mahitvanā́* ‘by greatness’, *ratna-dhēyā́* ‘by distribution of wealth’, *rāthyā́* ‘belonging to a car’, *vīryā́* ‘with heroism’, *sakhyā́* ‘with friendship’, *sarva-rathā́* ‘with the whole line of chariots’, *su-hāvā́* ‘with good invocation.’”

shift and their ‘un-shifted’ counterparts are more abundant in thematic adjective stems than in any other morphological category,¹⁶³ yet none of the thematic stems that make adverbs in *-ā́* also make non-adverbial forms in instrumental *-ā* (of any gender).

(94) ACCENTUAL MINIMAL PAIRS

- a. *dákṣiṇe* ‘in the right’
dakṣiṇé ‘in the right (hand)’ I.100.9
- b. *ádharāt*, abl. ‘from below’ X.42.11
adharā́t ‘from below; from the south’ 7×, VI+
- c. *úttarāt*, abl. ‘high’ IV.26.6, V.60.7
uttarā́t ‘from above’ VI.19.9, VIII.61.16
- d. *áparam*, m. acc. ‘the west’ I.31.4, ‘western’ X.139.2, ‘the one behind’ VI.47.15;
n. ‘later’ I.145.2
aparám ‘later, in the future’ 7×, II+
- e. *áparāya*, m. dat. ‘(for) the later one, successor’ VII.20.7
aparā́ya ‘for the future’ VI.33.5
- f. *pāre*, loc. ‘farther’ I.164. 12, ‘former’ I.166.13
paré ‘in the future’ VIII.61.17

While it is certainly possible that such forms are missing only due to accidental gaps in the Vedic corpus, it is a conspicuous gap in light of the fact that ‘accent-shifted’ adverbs from thematic stems are also more numerous in *-ā́* than in any other ending. It is repeatedly noted that there is a

¹⁶³ Even though it is not uncommon for adverbial forms to differ in accent (for one reason or another) from regular case-forms that are built to the same stem, it is surprisingly rare to find true minimal pairs that also match in case and are formally distinguished by accent alone; for example, *āṅgirasvant-/āṅgirasvát* and *drāvant-/dravát* are close matches, but neither of the barytone stems happens to be attested in the neuter singular accusative. The only genuine minimal pair that we have encountered in previous chapters is *patáyát/patayát*, and that if *patayát(-sakhm)* is a *vidad-vasu* type compound, we do not find a minimal pair even here (see §2.3). The only remaining pairs to be discussed in chapter §6 are inst. *divá́/divā́*, *guhá́/gúhā́* and a marginal case of gen.(?) *kṣapás/kṣāpas*.

particular connection between the \acute{a} ending and adverbial use,¹⁶⁴ but forms in \acute{a} are thought to be converted from ordinary case-forms all the same.

The synchronic isolation of thematic adverbs in \acute{a} could indicate that they are retentions. Isolated Vedic adverbs in \acute{a} from various stem types seem to reflect old instrumentals retained in adverbial use from an earlier stage of the language,¹⁶⁵ e.g. $\bar{i}rm\acute{a}$ ‘straightaway’ (5×, IV+),¹⁶⁶ $m\acute{y}\bar{s}\bar{a}$ ‘in vain’ (I.179.3)¹⁶⁷, $bh\bar{i}\bar{s}\bar{a}$ ‘with fear’ (3×, VII+), and also the $pa\acute{s}c\acute{a}$ type (see §4.2). In Greek, too, certain adverbs appear to be fossilized instrumentals, e.g. κρυφῆ ‘secretly’ and λάθρη ‘*ibid.*’ Retention can indeed explain the accent of a form like $n\bar{i}c\acute{a}$ ‘downward,’ where the accent ‘shifts’ to the instrumental ending as a regular consequence of ablaut. But taking \acute{a} to be the older, retained ending still does not account for the descriptive ‘accent shift’ that we consistently encounter in the thematic forms. For reasons already mentioned, I remain skeptical that certain adverbial retentions established a robust pattern of accent shift that could be extended even to non-ablauting stems by a sort of abstract analogy. The fact that so many thematic adverbs in \acute{a} are irregular in accent only compounds the problem that \acute{a} is not the synchronically expected instrumental ending for thematic adjectives—which, on its own, might be consistent with the idea that they are themselves retentions from an older stage of the language. That thematic adverbs in \acute{a} show multiple idiosyncrasies suggests to me that they are better analyzed as something other than thematic instrumentals.

The adverbs in \acute{e} , \acute{at} , \acute{am} , and \acute{aya} under (§93) are clearly thematic case-forms, with irregularly accented endings. On the other hand there are a number of sources that could produce

¹⁶⁴ Renou (1952: 325f.), “Remarquable est l’extension donnée à une finale \acute{a} s’attachant à des thèmes qui ne fournissent pas de fleion, ou du moins don’t la flexion ne comporte pas normalement cette finale.” MacDonnell (1910: 428f.) suggests that many adverbs in \acute{a} are isolated retentions.

¹⁶⁵ Whitney (§307, p.92), MacDonnell (1910: 257), Olander (2015: 165).

¹⁶⁶ Narten (1968: 246).

¹⁶⁷ EWA II 332.

final *-ā́* in the remaining adverbs. I think it is worth considering that we are looking at a directive/locative suffix *-ā́*, which is homophonous with the instrumental case ending but distinct in origin. Additional thematic adverbs in other grammatical cases can be formed with apparent ‘accent shift’ by analogy, if forms that were originally derived adverbs in the suffix *-ā́* are later reanalyzed as instrumental case-forms.

5.3 Thematic adverbs in *-ā́* with descriptive accent shift

An accented *-ā́* suffix added to thematic stems can account for apparent adverbial accent shift in *dakṣiṇā́*, *adharā́*, *amā́*, and *samanā́* directly and *dakṣiṇé*, *adharāt* and *uttarāt*, and *amāt* indirectly. Before I propose alternative sources of accented *-ā́*, in this section let us first survey the form and function of each of these adverbs in more detail. Only *aparām/-ā́ya*, *paré*, and *sanāt* lack obvious models in *-ā́*, and their origins will be theorized in §5.5.

5.3.1 *dakṣiṇā́*, *dakṣiṇé*

Inst. sg. *dakṣiṇā́* ‘to the right’ (II.27.11, X.17.9) and loc. sg. *dakṣiṇé* ‘in the right (hand)’ (I.100.9) are among the most commonly cited examples of adverbial accent shift, since they contrast accentually with the barytone adjective stem *dákṣiṇa-* ‘right, southern’ (46×, II+). In both verses where it appears, *dakṣiṇā́* is almost universally interpreted as a directional goal ‘(in)to the right or south.’¹⁶⁸

(95) *ná dakṣiṇā́ ví cikite ná savyā́*
ná prācīnam ādityā́ ná utá paścā́ (II.27.11ab)

‘I see far **neither to the right nor to the left**, neither forward nor behind, *Ādityas*.’

¹⁶⁸ This is the interpretation favored by Delbrück (1888a: 139), MacDonnell (1910: 428), AiG II/1 21, EWA I 690, and Hirt (1929: 287) as well as Grassmann and J&B. Geldner is in agreement regarding *dakṣiṇā́* in II.27.11 (‘weder **rechts** noch links’), but he interprets *dakṣiṇā́* in X.17.9b as a point of origin rather than the goal: ‘Sarasvati, die die Väter anrufen, **von rechts** zum Opfer antretend.’

- (96) *sárasvatīm yám pitáraḥ hávante*
dakṣiṇá yajñám abhinákṣamāñāḥ (X.17.9ab)

‘Sarasvatī, whom the forefathers invoke, as they arrive at the sacrifice **in the south**’

In II.27.11, *dakṣiṇá* forms an antonymic pair with *savyá* ‘to the left’ (: *savyá-*), which appears only in this verse. No one has proposed that *savyá* has undergone ‘adverbial accent shift,’ because its accent happens to correspond with the regularly oxytone adjectival stem *savyá-* ‘left.’ But the antonyms *dakṣiṇá* and *savyá* certainly appear to be morphologically equivalent. Both stems make regular m./n. instrumental singulars in *-ena*, which are used adverbially in later Vedic.¹⁶⁹

No instrumental *dákṣiṇā** with contrasting barytone accent is attested in the RV, but the locative adverbial *dakṣiṇé* forms an accentual minimal pair with barytone m. loc. sg. *dákṣiṇe*. The latter exclusively modifies m. loc. sg. *háste* ‘hand.’¹⁷⁰ The sole locative form with accent ‘shifted’ to the final syllable appears to be a substantive used in much the same sense, differing simply inasmuch as the noun *háste* is elided. Locative *dakṣiṇé* forms an antonymic pair with instrumental *savyéna* ‘with the left (hand)’ in the preceding pāda, which is functionally parallel despite the case discrepancy.

- (97) *sá savyéna yamati vrádhataś cit*
sá dakṣiṇé sámgrbhūtā kṛtāni (I.100.9ab)

‘He **with his left (hand)** will hold fast even the overweening (foes),
in his right will hold (all) winning throws massed together.’

Since *dakṣiṇé* is best understood with an elided *háste* in the context of I.100.9, it is an odd target for ‘adverbial’ accent shift. All other adverbs under (§93) treat the underlying stem as an abstract

¹⁶⁹ In the later language there are numerous case-forms of *dákṣiṇa-* that are used adverbially, without accent shift, notably including inst. sg. *dákṣiṇena* ‘on the right/south (of)’ (ŚB+).

¹⁷⁰ *dákṣiṇe* modifies *háste* in I.128.6, III.39.6 and VI.22.9.

substantive of direction, and not as a concrete masculine substantive. Let us assume for the moment that the distribution of forms—*dakṣiṇā́* in book II of the family books, and *dakṣiṇé* in the chronologically later book I—accurately reflects that the adverb in *-ā́* predates loc. sg. *dakṣiṇé*. If so, we may conjecture that, whatever the reason for its accent, *dakṣiṇā́* provides a template for adverbial accent shift in this stem, and adverbs in other cases can then be derived analogically.

5.3.2 *madhyā́* and *ubhayā́(-)*

madhyā́ ‘in the middle (of)’ 4×, II+ (: *mādhyā-*, adj./n. ‘middle’) and *ubhayā́* ‘on both sides’ X.108.6 (: *ubháya-*, adj. ‘both’) often enter into discussions of adverbial accent shift, but they are usually considered in conjunction with the *-(a)yā́* adverbs previously addressed under §3.1. While it is not unlikely that the forms did originate as haplologized forms of *madhyayā́** and *ubhayayā́**, it is also possible to follow Lanman (1880: 358) in taking *madhyā́* and *ubhayā́* simply as adverbs in *-ā́*, parallel in formation to *dakṣiṇā́* and the other adverbs in this section. Even if they originated as *-ayā́* adverbs, haplology renders that origin opaque. It is equally possible that they were synchronically regarded as *-ā́* instrumentals of the adjectival stems *mādhyā-* and *ubháya-*, with accent shift. Both adverbs do align semantically with other ‘accent-shifted’ adverbs from thematic stems, which universally share directive/locative semantics. The *-(a)yā́* adverbs do not observe the same general restriction.

Adverbial *ubhayā́* appears in the RV once as a simplex and once in a bahuvrihi compound *ubhayā́-dat-* ‘having teeth on both (jaws).’ No other case-forms of this stem are used adverbially.

- (98) *ádhyṣṭaḥ vaḥ étavái astu pánthāḥ*
*býhaspátih vaḥ **ubhayā́** ná mṛlāt* (X.108.6cd)

‘(or) let the path to you be impossible to follow—**either way**, Bṛhaspati will have no mercy on you!’

(99) *tāsmāt áśvāh ajāyanta*
*yé ké ca **ubhayādatah*** (X.90.10ab)

‘From it horses were born and whatever animals **have teeth on both jaws.**’

In three of its four appearances in the RV, *madhyá* is used as a preposition meaning ‘in the middle (of), among’ (II.38.4, I.115.4, I.89.9), taking a genitive object. It only appears without an object once, in X.61.6.

(100) ***madhyá** yát kártvam ábhavat abhīke*
kāmam kṛṇvāné pitári yuvatyām (X.61.6ab)

‘When what was to be done was **at its middle**, at the encounter when the father was making love to the young girl —’

It is noteworthy that locative *mádhye*, without accent shift, is used prepositionally with much the same sense. It usually takes a genitive object, but like *madhyá* it also appears (less frequently) without an object. Ablative *mádhyāt* is also used once as a preposition in VII.49.1, taking n. gen. *salilásya* as an object.

(101) *prasársrāṇaḥ ánu barhiḥ vṛśā síśuḥ*
***mádhye** yúvā ajāraḥ visrúhā hitáḥ* (V.44.3cd)

‘Always stretching out along the ritual grass, the bullish child, the unaging youth is placed **in the middle** with his outgrowth.’

(102) *samudrájyeṣṭhāḥ **salilásya mádhyāt***
punānāḥ yanti ániviśamānāḥ (VII.49.1ab)

‘They come **from the middle of the (heavenly?) ocean**, those whose chief is the sea — becoming pure, never settling down’

In light of these adverbial/prepositional parallels, it is unlikely that the apparent accent shift in *madhyá* is syntactically conditioned by its ‘adverbial’ status, regardless of whether it is best

analyzed as *madhyá* or as original **madhyayá*. Once again, adverbial accent shift seems to be associated with the particular form of the adverb, rather than with adverbial function *per se*.

5.3.3 *adharā(-)*, *adharāt* and *uttarāt*

Wackernagel-Debrunner assume the existence of an adverb *adhará* ‘downward, below’ on the basis of two Ṛgvedic compound stems. *adharāñc-* ‘beneath, lower’ is found twice in book X, and reflects underlying *adhará* + *-añc-*. The compound serves as the base of a further derivative *adharācīna-* ‘directed downwards’ II.17.5, whose earlier attestation in book II attests to the relative antiquity of both adjective stems and of the underlying adverb.¹⁷¹ Although the adverb *adhará* is unattested in the simplex, the ablative adverb *adharāt* ‘from below’ (7×, VI+) is relatively frequent. The accent of both *adharā(-)* and *adharāt* contrasts with the adjectival stem *ádhara-* ‘below.’ The latter form is often provided to demonstrate adverbial accent shift, along with its antonym *uttarāt* ‘from above’ 4×, VI+ (: *úttara-* ‘above’).

- (103) *á te súṣmaḥ vṛṣabháh etu paścát*
á uttarāt adharāt á purástāt (VI.19.9ab)

‘Let your unbridled force, a bull, come here
 from behind, here **from above and below**, here from in front.’

- (104) *tvám naḥ paścát adharāt uttarāt puráh*
índra ní pāhi viśvátaḥ (VIII.61.16ab)

‘from behind, **from beneath, from above**, from in front,
 Protect us from everywhere, Indra.’

Ablative adverbs *adharāt* and *uttarāt* exclusively occur in antonymic pairs within formulaic adverbial sequences meaning ‘from behind and in front, above and below,’ or ‘from west and east, north and south.’ These four-part sequences give the verbal action a sense of omnidirectionality or universality. The table below presents the forms that appear in each Ṛgvedic

¹⁷¹ See AiG III 19 on the reconstructed adverb *adhará*, and see §4.2.1 on the accent of *-añc-* stems.

sequence of ablative directional adverbs.¹⁷² Often the individual adverbs are appended with the ablative suffix *-tāt*, with no change in meaning or usage. In book X, *uttarāt* and *adharāt* alternate with extended forms *uttarāttāt* and *adharāttāt*, just as *purás* and *paścāt* alternate with *purástāt* and *paścātāt* in earlier books.

From	behind =west	front =east	above =north	below =south	misc.	RV
	<i>paścāt</i>	<i>purás</i>	–	–	–	II.41.11
	<i>paścāt</i>	<i>purástāt</i>	<i>uttarāt</i>	<i>adharāt</i>	–	VI.19.9
	<i>paścātāt</i>	<i>purástāt</i>	<i>údaktāt</i>	<i>adharāt</i>	–	VII.72.5=VII.73.5
	<i>ápāktāt</i>	<i>prāktāt</i>	<i>údaktāt</i>	<i>adharāt</i>	–	VII.104.19
	<i>paścātāt</i>	<i>purástāt</i>	–	–	<i>viśvátas</i>	VIII.48.15
	<i>paścāt</i>	<i>purás</i>	<i>uttarāt</i>	<i>adharāt</i>	<i>viśvátas</i>	VIII.61.16
	<i>paścātāt</i>	<i>prāk</i>	<i>uttarāttāt</i>	<i>adharāt</i>	–	X.27.15
	<i>paścātāt</i>	<i>purástāt</i>	<i>uttarāttāt</i>	<i>adharāttāt</i>	–	X.36.14
	<i>paścāt</i>	<i>purástāt</i>	<i>úttarasmāt</i>	<i>ádharāt</i>	<i>madhyatás</i>	X.42.11
	<i>paścāt</i>	<i>purástāt</i>	<i>údaktāt</i>	<i>adharāt</i>	–	X.87.20
	<i>paścāt</i>	<i>purástāt</i>	<i>údaktāt</i>	<i>adharāt</i>	–	X.87.21
	<i>paścāt</i>	<i>purástāt</i>	–	–	–	X.135.6

Table 5A – RV SEQUENCES OF DIRECTIONAL ABL. ADVERBS

purás(tāt)...paścāt(āt) ‘from in front and from behind’ occurs three times as a binary pair without a corresponding pair meaning ‘...and from above and below’ to complete the four-part formula. Those same forms—*purás* (51×, II+), *purástāt* (32×, II+), and *paścāt* (26×, II+)—are also attested independently of the formulaic adverbial sequences listed in table §5A above.¹⁷³ All evidence indicates that the antonymic pair *purás(-tāt)/paścāt* makes up the core of the omnidirectional formula. The remaining forms in the table, including *adharāt* and *uttarāt* as well as

¹⁷² While a formula of sorts is in operation, the sequence of adverbial ablatives is subject to variation. In context, the order of the adverbs varies, and other sentence elements freely intervene. In addition to those in table §5A, there are additional four-part directional sequences that show an even greater variety of forms. In VIII.28.3, the familiar form *purástāt* is contrasted with acc. *niak*, *údak* and inflected adj. *apāciás*. Compare the accusative adv. sequences *prāk ápāk údak nyak* VIII.4.1 (=VIII.65.1) and *prāk ápāk údak* III.53.11, and also the series of inflected adjectives *prācaḥ ápācaḥ údicaḥ adharācaḥ* in X.131.1, all modifying *amitrān*.

¹⁷³ Of the extended forms in *-tāt*, *adharāt-tāt* and *uttarāt-tāt* only occur when *paścātāt* is also used (X.27.15, X.36.14). *paścātāt*, in contrast, is used on other occasions: opposite *purástāt* alone (VIII.48.15), once adjacent to *údaktāt* in than *uttarāt(tāt)* (VII.72.5), and twice adjacent to an un-extended *adharāt* (VII.72.5, X.27.15).

práktāt, *údaktāt*, etc., occur exclusively in the context of these four-part directional adverb sequences. They are possibly innovated within the context of the adverbial formula.

Barytone ablatives *ádharāt* and *úttarāt* do both appear in the RV to make accentual minimal pairs with adverbial *adharāt* and *uttarāt*. The accentual distinction between adverbial *uttarāt* and barytone *úttarāt* accompanies a clear distinction in usage. In both of its occurrences in book X, *úttarāt* modifies *dívas* as an attributive adjective, together meaning ‘from high(er) heaven.’ The distinction between *adharāt* and barytone *ádharāt* is less immediately apparent. The sole attestation of barytone *ádharāt* is listed in table §5A above, because, like the oxytone adverb, it is used in a four-part sequence of ablatives that modify the verbal action.

(105) *br̥haspátih nah̄ pári pātu páścāt*
utá úttarasmāt ádharāt aghāyóh
índrah purástāt utá madhyatáh nah̄
sákhā sákhibhyaḥ vārivaḥ kṛṇotu (X.42.11)

‘Let Indra, lord of the formulation, protect us all around from behind and from above and **below from him who wishes ill**, from in front and from the middle. Let him, as comrade, create wide space for his comrades.’

Barytone *ádharāt* functions prepositionally in X.42.11, taking genitive *aghāyóh* as its object. Accent-shifted *adharāt* is strictly adverbial and never takes an object in this way. There is also a neuter accusative *ádharam* ‘lower’ in X.166.3 from the same stem, which likewise functions prepositionally and retains barytone accent.

(106) *vācaḥ pate ní sedha imán*
yáthā māt ádharam vādān (X.166.3cd)

‘O Lord of Speech, drive these down, so that they will speak **lower than me**.’

The accentual contrast between adverbial *adharāt* and the prepositional forms *ádharāt* and *ádharam* could indicate that prepositional case-forms with objects are somehow ineligible for

‘adverbial’ accent shift. However, there is a great deal of overlap between prepositional and adverbial functions throughout all stages of the language.¹⁷⁴ With *madhyā* in the previous section, we have just seen a form with purported ‘adverbial accent shift’ that functions as a preposition more often than as an independent adverb. In my opinion, it is preferable to attribute the selective application of accent shift in various case-forms of *adhara-* to independent pathways of formation. Barytone *ádharāt* and *ádharam* represent the default situation: adjectival case-forms that function as adverbs or prepositions do not, as a rule, undergo accent shift. The fact that the antonym of barytone *ádharāt* in X.42.11 is supplied by *úttarasmāt*, a pronominal alternative to the usual ablative *uttarāt*,¹⁷⁵ supports the theory that the forms in this particular verse are independently supplied from the adjectival paradigms rather than borrowed from an adverbial formula. Meanwhile, no barytone instrumental *ádharā** is attested that contrasts accentually with adverbial *adharā(-)*; while it is possible that it is a converted instrumental, I believe that the accent itself is evidence against this. The form may also be derived in an accented locative/directive suffix *-ā*, and *adharāt* formed by analogy.

No synonymous adverb ever replaces *adharāt(-tāt)* in the formulaic adverbial sequences in table §5A, but *uttarāt(tāt)* and synonymous *údaktāt* ‘from above’ are used interchangeably. Given that *uttarāt* invariably occurs next to its antonym *adharāt*, it is entirely possible that it was formed by the analogy *ádhara-* ‘lower’ : *adharāt* ‘from below’ :: *úttara-* ‘upper’ : *x*, where *x* is an adverb derived with an analogical suffix *-āt* whose accent overrides that of the underlying barytone stem. The formulaic nature of the adverbial sequences in table §5A encourages analogical innovation. Alternatively, there is evidence in later Vedic that there also existed an

¹⁷⁴ According to Brugmann (1904: 570), it is impossible to make a clear distinction between adverbs, particles, and prepositions as separate categories.

¹⁷⁵ Abl. *úttarasmāt* appears only one other time in the RV: it is used adnominally in X.98.5, in an elliptical construction with an abl. referent *samudrāt* elided.

adverb *uttarā́*, parallel in construction to *adharā́*, which could have produced an ablative adverb *uttarāt* through a similar process. Though simplex *uttarā́** is unattested, there are a number of compounds with first member *uttarā́-* in later Vedic, e.g. *uttarā́-vant-* ‘being above, overpowering’ (AV+) and *uttarā́-sád-* ‘seated northward/on the left’ (VS).

5.3.4 *samanā́*

samanā́ ‘evenly, altogether’ 13×, II+ (cf. Got. *samana* ‘together’) derives from *sámana-*, which only rarely functions as an adjective ‘together’ in the RV. It is usually a neuter substantive meaning ‘meeting (place)’ or, figuratively, ‘battle.’ *sámana-* ‘together’ can be considered an adjective of location inasmuch as it expresses the relative position. As an adverb in the ending *-ā́*, it is used with verbs of motion in the earlier books, and it later specializes to mean ‘in the same way.’

- (107) *vi samanā́ bhūmih aprathiṣṭa*
āramṣta párvataḥ cit sarisṷán (II.11.7)

‘The land has spread out **equally in all directions**.¹⁷⁶ Even the mountain, which was about to run, has come to rest.’

- (108) *tā́h ā́ caranti samanā́ purástāt*
samā́nātaḥ samanā́ paprathā́nā́h (IV.51.8ab)

‘They proceed, **in the same way**, from the east, spreading out from the same place **in the same way**.’

5.3.5 *amā́, amāt*

amā́ ‘at home’ (9×, II+) and *amāt* ‘from nearby’ (V.53.8; IX.97.8) ostensibly derive from a pronominal stem *áma-* ‘this, self,’¹⁷⁷ rather than to a thematic adjective stem like the other adverbs in this section. The ‘unshifted’ pronominal stem *áma-* appears only once in the

¹⁷⁶ Geldner translates ‘gleichmässig.’

¹⁷⁷ AiG III 532f.; EWA I 95.

Atharvaveda: *ámo* ‘*ham asmi sá tvám* ‘**this** I am, that you are’ (AV XIV.2.71a). OP *ama-ta*^(h) ‘from near’ attests that the stem is inherited, although it cannot corroborate the accent. The accentual distinction between the adverbs and the AV pronoun has lead many to label *amá* and *amát* additional cases of adverbial accent shift, parallel to the thematic adjectives in this section.¹⁷⁸

In the RV, a number of *a*-stems make ‘accent-shifted’ adverbs in *-á*, but only rarely do *a*-stem adjectives make ordinary case-forms in instrumental *-ā*. There is no overlap between the two sets (see fn. 164–5). The same is not true in the pronominal declension, where it is common to find both adverbs and instrumental case-forms in *-á*. Inst. sg. *ayá* ‘in this way’¹⁷⁹ and *ená* ‘here, in this way’ function adverbially, but they are also ordinary instrumental singular demonstrative pronouns. There are a number of strictly adverbial pronouns in *-á* as well, including *aná* ‘then, hereby, thus, indeed’ (5×, IV+), *idá* ‘at this time’ (12×, IV+), and a number of other temporal adverbs in *°dá*.¹⁸⁰ As a pronominal adverb, it is unremarkable that *amá* takes the instrumental ending *-ā* (as opposed to m./n. *-ena* or f. *-ayā*). In context, *amá* functions either locatively meaning ‘at home’ or as a directive ‘homewards.’

(109) *amá iva naḥ suhavāḥ á hí gántana* (II.36.3a)
‘As if **to home**, come to us here, all you of easy call’

(110) *amá ca enam áraṇye páhi riśáh*
mádema śatáhimāḥ suvīrāḥ (VI.24.10cd)
‘Protect him from harm **at home** and in the wilderness.—Having good heroes might we rejoice for a hundred winters.’

¹⁷⁸ The literature does not typically distinguish between adverbs with so-called ‘accent shift’ from pronominal and adjectival stems. Kurylowicz (1952: 22), MacDonnell (1910: 429), Delbrück (1893: 542), and Gotō (2013: 148), and others directly equate *amá* and *amát* with the other thematic adverbs under (§93).

¹⁷⁹ Schmidt (1889: 212ff., fn. 1) explains that *ayá* was originally a genderless instrumental singular demonstrative pronoun (cf. gen./loc. du. *ayós*) that only later specialized as a feminine case-form. See §3.1.2.

¹⁸⁰ Renou (1952: 326) remarks upon the the considerable productivity of adverbial *-á* on pronominal bases, including e.g. *kadá* ‘when?’, *tadá* ‘then’, *yadá* ‘when’ in addition to those listed above. See also Hirt (1929: 287).

In Vedic, pronouns are known to make ablative adverbs with the normal thematic ending *-āt* rather than the pronominal ending *-asmāt*, e.g. *āt* ‘then, next, now’, *tāt* ‘so, in this way’, *yāt* ‘so far/long as’ instead of *ásmāt*, etc.¹⁸¹ Like instrumental *amā́*, ablative *amāt* takes the ending that is expected for a pronominal adverb.

- (111) *ā́ yāta marutaḥ diváḥ*
ā́ antárikṣāt amāt utá
mā́ áva sthāta parāvataḥ (V.53.8)
 ‘Drive hither, Maruts, from heaven, from the midspace, and **from nearby**. Do not stay away at a distance.’

The fact remains that there is a difference of accent between AV *ámas* and RV *amā́/-āt*. There is a certain amount of accentual irregularity at work in the pronominal adverbs, but it is not systematic and is usually not considered the result of adverbial accent shift. For instance, *ayā́* ‘in this way’ contrasts accentually with *káyā* ‘in what manner?’ and *táyā* ‘in that manner,’ but it is difficult to ascribe the distinction to adverbial accent shift, since ending-accented *ayā́* itself may be either adverbial or demonstrative. Meanwhile *káyā* and *táyā* also function adverbially, yet they are not marked by a shift of accent. Even Lanman (1880: 357), who makes the most extensive explanatory use of adverbial accent shift, affirms, “In the case of *ayā́*, [ending accent] is something peculiar to that pronoun, and not adverbial.” The accent of *yáthā* ‘in such a way,’ *táthā* ‘in this way,’ and *kathā́* ‘in which way?’ is similarly inconsistent, but distributed differently among the stems. I am reluctant to take the lone barytone form *ámas* in late Vedic as reliable evidence that RV *amā́* and *amāt* show an accentual distinction that is predicated on adverbial function, given that similar pronominal stems show unsystematic accentual variation.

¹⁸¹ Whitney (§1114, p.363).

5.4 Adverbial suffix *-ā*

5.4.1 Adverbial suffixes *-tās*, *-trā*...and *-ā*?

There is precedent for the accent to be drawn rightward in adverbs that are derived by certain suffixes with ablative or locative sense. Derivatives in *-tas* and *-tra* are nearly always accented either on the suffix itself or on the syllable immediately preceding it,¹⁸² e.g. *amú-tas* ‘from here’ 4×, I+ (: prn. *amú-*), *viśvá-tas* ‘on/from all sides’ 60×, II+ (: *viśva-* ‘all’), *sarvá-tas* ‘from all sides’ 2×, II+ (: *sárva-* ‘all’), but *i-tās* ‘from here’ 29×, III+ (: prn. *i-*), *savyá-tās* ‘from/on the left’ II.11.18 (: *savyá-*), *agratās* ‘in front’ X.90.7 (: *ágra-* ‘top, front’). When there exists an adverbial derivative in *-tra* next to another in *-tas* from the same base, they invariably correspond in accent, e.g. *viśvá-tas* ‘on all sides’ and *viśvá-tra* ‘everywhere’ X.61.25. In the RV, however, more often than *-trā* we find the suffix *-trā́* with an accented long vowel. The derivation of adverbs in *-tas* and *-trā* often involves a rightward shift of accent, but it is not typically regarded as a proper example of ‘adverbial accent shift,’ which is a label reserved for converted case-forms.

Several of the *a*-stems that make adverbs in *-ā́* with so-called ‘adverbial accent shift’ also make derivatives in *-tas* and *-tra*; compare their accentual properties in table §5B below.¹⁸³

Stem	<i>-tas</i>	<i>-tra/-trā́</i>	<i>-ā́</i>
<i>dákṣiṇa-</i> ‘right’	<i>dakṣiṇatās</i> 6×, II+	<i>dakṣiṇatrā́</i> VI.18.9	<i>dakṣiṇā́</i> 2×, II+
<i>mádhyā-</i> ‘middle’	<i>madhyatās</i> 3×, III+	—	<i>madhyā́</i> 4×, II+
<i>ubháya-</i> ‘both (sides)’	<i>ubhayátas</i> 2×, V+	<i>ubhayátra</i> III.53.5	<i>ubhayā́</i> X.108.6

¹⁸² Whitney (§1098-99, p.358f.), MacDonnell (1910: 425). A rare exception with antepenultimate accent is *ántitas* ‘from the vicinity’ 6×, II+ (: *ánti* ‘near’). Derivatives from prepositions seem to maintain the accent of the base; compare *abhítas* ‘around’ 23×, II+ (: *abhí*).

¹⁸³ Although the stem *áma-* makes no *-tas* or *-tra* derivatives in Vedic, OP *ama-tā^(h)* ‘thence’ (<*-*tas*) beside RV *amā́* ‘at home’ further attests to the overlap between adverbs in *-tas*, *-tra*, and *-ā́*.

<i>savyá-</i> 'left'	<i>savyatás</i> II.11.18	—	<i>savyá</i> II.27.11
<i>viśva-</i> 'all, every'	<i>viśvátas</i> 60×, II+	<i>viśvátra</i> X.61.25	* <i>viśvā-</i>

Table 5B – ACCENT IN *-tas*, *-tra*, *-ā* ADVERBS

If final *-ā* in *dakṣiṇā*, *madhyā*, *ubhayā* (and *samanā*, *adharā*, *uttarā*) is an adverbial suffix analogous to *-tā́s* and *-trā́*, this offers at least a partial explanation of its ability to draw the accent rightward. The underlying accent of *a*-stems in final *-ā* is ambiguous, such that we may be seeing *dakṣiṇā* < **dakṣiṇa-ā* (cf. *dakṣiṇa-tás*), *madhyā* < **madhya-ā* (cf. *madhya-tás*), but also, at the same time, *ubhayā* < **ubhayá-ā* (cf. *ubhayá-tas*). It is unknown why some stems make *-tā́s* and *-trā́* adverbs with stem-final accent while others have accent on the suffix. Either way, the rightward shift of accent in both *dákṣiṇa-* → *dakṣiṇa-tás* and *ubháya-* → *ubhayá-tas*, for example, relates to this specific type of suffixal derivation. Accent shift is not the sole means by which the adverbial forms are distinguished from the non-adverbial forms, and it is presumably not part of a more general process that affects adverbial case-forms as an abstract category.

If the *-ā́* suffix operates like *-tā́s* and *-trā́*, we would expect it to have a wider scope of application than the handful of examples with adverbial accent shift. In fact, there may indeed be many more examples in suffix *-ā́* that have flown under the radar as ordinary (or archaic) instrumentals, because their accent is regular under either analysis. When *-ā́* is suffixed to an oxytone stem, the resulting adverb would not appear to undergo adverbial accent shift at all. In §5.3.1 above, I noted that an adverbial form *savyā́* 'to the left' appears in II.27.11 as the antonym of *dakṣiṇā́* 'to the right.' It is traditionally considered to be an unremarkable (feminine?) instrumental of *savyá-* 'left.' Adverbial *savyā́* could indeed be a slightly unusual instrumental, or it could just as easily be the reflex of **savya-ā́* (cf. *savya-tás*), derived from the stem by the adverbial suffix *-ā́*.

One other example may be **viśvá* ‘in all directions’ (: *viśva-* ‘all, every’), which is unattested in the simplex. The thematic stem *viśva-* ‘all’ serves as the base of adverbs *viśvá-tas* and *viśvá-tra*, but it could also be the base of an adverb *viśvá* (< **viśvá-ā*) ‘in all directions.’ An adverb *viśvá* would settle the problem of the accent in the compound *viśváñc-* ‘facing all directions.’ The expected outcome of *viśva-* + *-añc-* would be *viśváñc-**, since the accent of *-añc-* stems typically remains on the first syllable when *-añc-* is added to a barytone first member. The fixed accent on the contracted *ā* better reflects an adverbial first member *viśvá* ‘everywhere, in all directions.’ The solution is especially appealing, given that *-añc-* is nearly always compounded with adverbs.¹⁸⁴ Similarly, *adharā(ñ)c-* ‘beneath, lower’ has been taken as evidence for the existence of an adverb *adharā** ‘lower’ with accent shift.

For the most part, adverbial suffixes like *-tas* and *-trā* derive from inflected pronouns and root-nouns.¹⁸⁵ One potential source of an analogous suffix *-ā* that makes adverbs of direction might be the directive adverb/preposition *ā* ‘near (to), toward,’ which is thought to originate from an old instrumental of the pronominal stem *a-*.¹⁸⁶

5.4.2 Analogical model 1: *antar-ā* (cf. *ántara-*)

The accent of adverbs in *-ā* is consistent with derived adverbs in *-tā*s and *-trā*, but it could also be that *-ā* is simply an accented derivational suffix. For example, although *ubhayā* may reflect underlying **ubhayā-ā* (cf. *ubhayā-tas*), it may equally be analyzed as **ubhaya-ā*. It is still worth considering *ā* ‘near (to), toward’ as the source of an accented *-ā* suffix, by an analogical route.

ā is frequently prefixed to verbs and nouns, but it may also be a separable adverb that gives force to the word preceding it. In at least one case, it is already known to become a pseudo-

¹⁸⁴ E.g. *pārāñc-* (= *pārā* + *-añc-*), *satrāñc-* (= *satrā* + *-añc-*), and a majority of *-añc-* stems with preverb initial members; see §4.2.1 on the accent and construction of *-añc-* stems.

¹⁸⁵ Gotō (2013: 145f.).

¹⁸⁶ < **éh₁* ~ **óh₁*. See EWA I 157f. and references.

suffix via univerbation with a preceding adverb: *antar-á* ‘in the middle, between’ 7×, III+ (: *antár* ‘inside, between’¹⁸⁷ + *á*).

- (112) *yát antará parāvátam*
arvāvátam ca hūyáse
índra ihá tátataḥ á gahi (III.40.9)

‘If you are invoked **between** the far and the nearby, Indra, come here from there.’

Alongside *antar-á*, there is also a common thematic adjective *ántara-* ‘within, between, close’ 18×, II+. It appears not to be a thematization of the adverb *antár*, but rather formed in the comparative suffix *-tara-*.¹⁸⁸ Although *antará* ‘between’ and *ántara-* ‘within’ are formed independently of one another, it is not unlikely that the forms were synchronically associated. A perceived synchronic relationship of adj. *ántara-* : adv. *antará* would establish an analogical model for adverbs in accented *-á* from thematic adjectives. Looking specifically at the morphological make-up of the model *ántara-* : *antará*, it may not be an accident that several of the thematic case-forms with apparent adverbial accent shift belong to *-ra-/-tara-* comparative stems. If we focus on semantics, it is just as natural for *antará* ‘in the middle, between’ to provide the model for *madhyá* ‘in the middle,’ and other adjectives of direction and location.

- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--------------------------------|---|---|----|----------------------------|---|---|
| (113) | <i>ántara-</i>
adj. ‘inner’ | : | <i>antará</i>
adv. ‘inside, between’ | :: | <i>ádharma-</i>
‘lower’ | : | <i>adhará</i>
‘downward, below’ |
| | “ | | “ | :: | <i>mádhyā-</i>
‘middle’ | : | <i>madhyá</i>
‘in the middle’ |

¹⁸⁷ < **(h₁)en-ter* ~ **(h₁)n-ter*, cf. OIr. *eter* ‘between,’ Lat. *inter* ‘between, under,’ YAv./OAv. *aṅtarə* ‘between, within,’ OP <atr> = /antar/ ‘through, under, in.’ EWA I 76f. MacDonnell (1910: 427) cites *pur-á* ‘earlier, before, from of old’ (cf. *pur-ás*) as another case of univerbation with *á*.

¹⁸⁸ The stem *ántara-* < **(h₁)en-tero-* (cf. YAv. *aṅtara-* ‘internal, inside,’ Lat. *interior*, Gk. *ἐντερα* ‘innards’) is not to be confused with a homophonous stem *ántara-* ‘distant, other’ (TS, Br.+) < **h₂en-tero-*, which does not occur in the RV. See EWA I 76f.

5.4.3 Analogical model 2: *madhyá* and *ubhayá* < *-*ayá*

When *á* is used in conjunction with a noun or adjective, it is either directly added as a prefix, or else it follows inflected case-forms, most often locatives, as a separable adverb. Avestan and Old Persian parallels, which are frequently unverbated, attest to the antiquity of the syntagm locative *-e + á*. Although it does not undergo regular synchronic univibration in Vedic to the same extent as in other branches, unverbated loc. *-e + á* has been put forth as the historical source of adverbs in *-(a)yá*.¹⁸⁹

Whereas Lanman (1880: 358) analyzes *madhyá* and *ubhayá* as feminine *-ā* instrumentals, Wackernagel-Debrunner analyze both forms as haplogitized forms of original *ubhayayá** and *madhyayá** with the adverbial suffix *-(a)yá*.¹⁹⁰ At the same time, *mádhye + á* ‘in the middle (of)’ (5x, III+) is also produced synchronically in the RV, without univibration. If *madhyá* is genuinely a haplogitized adverb, the fact that it cooccurs in the RV with a non-unverbated phrase comprised of the same material suggests that *madhyá* was synchronically opaque. This being the case, it may well have been synchronically reanalyzed as a case-form of adjectival *mádhya-*, with the appearance of adverbial accent shift. With locative semantics and independently motivated ‘shift’ of accent, *mádhya-* : *madhyá* (and to a lesser extent and *ubháya-* : *ubhayá*) provides another potential model for the analogical innovation of thematic adverbs with descriptive shift of accent. This only holds true, of course, under the theory that the forms derive by haplology for original **madhyayá* and **ubhayayá*.

(114) *mádhya-* : *madhyá* :: *dákṣiṇa-* : *dakṣiṇá*
 adj. ‘middle’ adv. ‘in the middle’ adj. ‘right’ adv. ‘on the right’

¹⁸⁹ See §3.1 for the locative + *á* construction as a possible origin of *-ayá* adverbs.

¹⁹⁰ AiG III 76, following Bartholomae (1889: 21, fn. 4).

5.4.4 Extension to other case endings

Whatever their original source, derived adverbs in *-ā́* like *dakṣiṇā́*, *adharā́*, *samanā́*, etc. are synchronically reanalyzed as instrumental case-forms in adverbial use because of their resemblance to *-ā* instrumentals in all but accent. Adverbs in suffix *-ā́* from oxytone stems, e.g. *savyá-* → *savyā́* (which cooccurs with *dakṣiṇā́* in II.27.11), encourage the reanalysis as synchronic *-ā* instrumentals because the derived adverb in accented *-ā́* is entirely regular within the productive paradigm. It is at this point that ‘accent shift’ extends even to non-instrumental case-forms. My main issue with Delbrück (1893)’s explanation of adverbial accent shift in thematic stems is that he fails to identify the model(s) that supposedly established a pattern of accent shift in adverbial case-forms. As a result, he over-generalizes productive adverbial oxytonesis, describing a process that is theoretically capable of affecting a potentially unlimited number of adverbial case-forms. In reality, however, only a very few forms ever undergo a similar shift, and a majority of them derive from stems that also happen to make adverbs in *-ā́*. This has all the appearance of propagation by analogy. Reanalyzed as archaic instrumentals with irregular accent, the adverbs in *-ā́* establish the existence of oxytone adverbial by-forms from certain adjectival stems of direction. Adverbial by-forms in other case-endings can then be innovated from those stems with relative freedom, based on normal patterns of inflection.

(115) ANALOGICAL CREATION OF THEMATIC ADVERBS FROM MODELS IN *-ā́*

<i>ádharā́*</i>	:	<i>ádharāt</i>	::	<i>adharā́</i>	:	<i>adharāt</i>
inst. ‘lower’		abl. ‘below’		‘downward’		‘from below’
<i>úttarā́*</i>	:	<i>úttarāt</i>	::	<i>uttarā́</i>	:	<i>uttarāt</i> ¹⁹¹
inst. ‘upper’		abl. ‘above’		‘upward’		‘from above’
<i>dákṣiṇā́*</i>	:	<i>dákṣiṇe</i>	::	<i>dakṣiṇā́</i>	:	<i>dakṣiṇé</i>

¹⁹¹ Alternatively, given that *uttarāt* invariably occurs in a formulaic adverbial sequence next to its antonym *adharāt*, it is also possible that it was formed by the analogy *ádharā- : adharāt :: úttarā- : x*.

inst. ‘right’

loc. ‘right’

‘rightward’

‘on the right’

5.5 ‘Accent-shifted’ thematic adverbs without models in *-ā́*

To this point, I have relied on concrete analogical relationships to explain the irregular accent of various adverbial case-forms, without resorting to an abstract process of ‘adverbial accent shift’ as it is usually characterized in the literature. It is not as straightforward a prospect to take *aparám/-ā́ya*, *paré*, and *sanā́t* as analogical innovations, since they lack obvious models in *-ā́*. At this point in the overall investigation of ‘adverbial accent shift,’ these four are the only purported examples of rightward adverbial accent shift for which I have not yet suggested some alternative pathway of derivation. As more and more purported examples of accent shift are critiqued or even eliminated, it becomes increasingly implausible that productive adverbial accent shift is the answer for the few forms remaining.

As I see it, there are two main avenues open to us to explain the accent in these forms. One option is to seek different analogical models altogether, which may have nothing to do with the other thematic adverbs in this chapter. The other is that we may be looking at ‘genuine’ adverbial accent shift as described by Delbrück, in so far as the concrete pairs we have already encountered (e.g. *dákṣiṇe* : *dakṣiṇé*, *ádharāt* : *adharā́t* etc.) establish an abstract pattern of oxytonesis in adverbial case-forms of directive/locatival thematic adjectives.

5.5.1 *aparám/-ā́ya*

Neuter accusative *aparám* 7×, II+ and dative *aparā́ya* VI.33.5 both relate to the barytone comparative adjective *ápara-* ‘hinder, later’ 21×, II+ (: *ápa* ‘away, back’). The stem is most often to be understood as a masculine substantive meaning ‘later (one), successor,’ whereas in both of the adverbial case-forms the stem acts as a temporal abstract, meaning ‘the future.’

Dative *aparāya* is most likely a secondary case variant of its more common synonym *aparām*, from which it inherits the distinctive adverbial accent.¹⁹² An account of the accent of *aparām* will therefore account also for the accent of *aparāya*, in the same analogical manner shown under (§115) above.

(116) *abhikṣattāraḥ abhī ca kṣāmadhvam*
adyā ca naḥ mṛḷāyata aparām ca (II.29.2cd)

‘As apportioners, be indulgent and be merciful to us, both today and **for the future.**’

(117) *nūnām naḥ indra aparāya ca syāḥ*
bhāvā mṛḷkāḥ utā naḥ abhīṣtau (VI.33.5ab)

‘(So) should you be for us, now and **for the future**, Indra. Be there for us in mercy and in superiority.’

Both adverbs make minimal pairs with ‘unshifted’ barytone counterparts. M./n. sg. *áparam* functions differently in each of its four appearances: it is a masculine substantive ‘the one behind’ in VI.47.15 and a neuter abstract in the accusative ‘to the west’ in I.31.4, and it is also used adnominally as both ‘western’ (with m. *ketúm*, X.139.2) and ‘later’ (n. *vācas*, I.145.2). Its versatility, taken together with the fact that comparable *-ra-* stems are also barytone, indicates that barytone accent is indeed synchronically underlying to this stem. As a result, we can be fairly certain that we are not dealing with a situation analogous to that of *apāká-* and *upāká-* in §4.1 of the previous chapter, where I argue that oxytone accent is underlying in the adverbial forms.¹⁹³

¹⁹² An old idea, already put forth by Thomson (1891: 23): “Vielleicht aber dürfen wir hier annehmen...dass der vereinzelte adverbelle Dativ sich in seiner Betonung an den häufigen adverbiellen Accusativ angelehnt hat, dass heisst, dass wir es mit der Weiterbildung einer geläufigen adverbiellen Form zu thun haben.”

¹⁹³ Although *ápara-* ‘behind, inferior’ and *pára-* ‘exceeding, high’ are occasionally used as antonyms, it does not suit the situation to analyze *ápara-* as a privative compound unrelated to adverbial case-forms in oxytone *apará-* (see AiG II/2 217). Nor is it economical to propose that the barytone accent results from substantivization of an earlier oxytone stem, as I argue in the case of *úpāka-*.

The comparative stem and accusative case of *aparám* give the form a certain resemblance to *-tarám* adverbs, another group with so-called accent shift addressed in chapter §3. There is also a semantic dimension to the resemblance: in certain uses, *pratarám* ‘further, in the future’ and *aparám* ‘in the future’ are synonymous. The fact that *-tarám* adverbs are not adjectival stems in origin does not preclude the possibility that they were synchronically associated with comparative adjectives in *-tara-*, and by extension comparative adjectives in *-ra-*, enough to influence the accent of adverbial acc. sg. *aparám*. Renou (1952: 327) assumes that *aparám* takes on ‘shifted’ accent due to its association with *-tarám* adverbs. The analogical scenario is only slightly complicated by the fact that there is also, in later Vedic, an adverb *apatarám* ‘further away’(MS). The obvious conclusion is simply that adverbial *apatarám* is produced directly from *ápa* by the formula *prá : pratarám :: ápa → apatarám*. Adverbial *aparám*, on the other hand, is not an adverbial innovation based on the model of *pra-tarám*. Rather, it originates as a case-form of adjectival *ápara-* in adverbial use, with its accent secondarily remodeled under the influence of *pratarám* and other *-tarám* adverbs.

The oxytone accent of *aparám* in contrast to the barytone accent of *ápara-* constitutes a ‘genuine’ case of adverbial accent shift, only inasmuch as the forms involved in this analogical scenario happen to be adverbs. Adverbial function plays a minor role in the analogically-induced shift of accent, only as part of the broader-reaching similarities of form and function between *pratarám* and *aparám*.

5.5.2 *paré*

Adverbial *paré* ‘in the future’ VIII.61.17 (: *pára-* ‘distant, further’) is another purported case of adverbial accent shift in a thematic locative. It makes a minimal pair with a barytone loc. sg.

páre, which is found twice in book I and is an attributive adjective both times.¹⁹⁴ There is a model for ‘adverbial accent shift’ in thematic loc. sg. *dakṣiṇé* ‘on the right’ (: *dákṣiṇe*), but it is not an impressively close parallel with temporal *paré* in form or semantics. On the other hand, adverbial *paré* is virtually synonymous with both *aparám* and *aparāya*. Beyond sharing the same basic meaning, all three adverbs are consistently used in the same context. They occur in supplications to the gods, where they are coordinated with either *adyá* ‘today’ or *nūnám* ‘now.’¹⁹⁵ Together, the present and future adverbs characterize the action requested of the gods as perpetual and ongoing.

(118) *adyá-adyā śuváh-śuva*
indra trāsva paré ca naḥ (VIII.61.17ab)

‘Today after today, tomorrow after tomorrow, rescue us, O Indra—and **in the future.**’

Comparative morphology is an additional link between *paré* (: *pára-*) and other stems that yield adverbial case-forms with contrasting accent. Although the pronominal adjective stem *pára-* < **pér-o-* is not a true comparative in the *-ra-* morpheme, its surface form is similar. It is also semantically associated with comparative adjectives of direction, frequently used as the antonym of *ávára-*, *úpara-*, and *ántara-*.¹⁹⁶ I have already observed that a high proportion of ‘accent-shifted’ thematic adverbs derive from comparative *-ra-/-tara-* stems. Although none of these are in the locative case, there are examples in a range of different case endings. Adverbial case-forms with irregular final accent are derived from barytone comparative adjective stems with

¹⁹⁴ Attributive *páre* is to be taken once as locative ‘upper’ (I.164. 12) and once as temporal ‘earlier’ (I.166.13). The temporal semantics of *pára-* ‘distant, further away’ extend in both directions, such that the stem’s potential meanings include both ‘ancient, earlier’ and also ‘future.’

¹⁹⁵ Only *aparám* in X.86.11 lacks a coordinated adverb. Otherwise *aparám* occurs with *adyá* four times (I.36.6, I.184.1, II.29.2, VIII.27.14) and with *nūnám* twice (I.189.4, II.28.8).

¹⁹⁶ *pára-* = ‘more distant’ with *ántara-* ‘closer’ 5×, II+; = ‘earlier’ with *ávára-* ‘later’ 7×, IV+; = ‘first’ with *ávára-* ‘last’ 4×, II+; = ‘farther, higher, celestial’ with *ávára-* ‘nearer, lower, earthly’ 4×, VII+, with *úpara-* 2×, I.

enough regularity to establish a pattern of accentual mismatch between adjectival and adverbial case-forms. As a synonym and the functional equivalent of *aparám* and *aparāya*, a barytone adverbial **páre* ‘in the future’ would be all the more susceptible to analogical accent shift.

$$(119) \left(\begin{array}{l} \acute{a}ntar\bar{a}^* : antar-\acute{a} \\ \acute{a}dhar\bar{a} : adhar-\acute{a} \\ \acute{a}dhar\bar{a}t : adhar-\acute{a}t \\ \acute{u}ttar\bar{a} : uttar-\acute{a} \\ \acute{u}ttar\bar{a}t : uttar-\acute{a}t \\ \acute{a}param : apar-\acute{a}m \\ \acute{a}par\bar{a}ya : apar-\acute{a}ya \end{array} \right) :: \quad \acute{p}are : \mathbf{par\acute{e}}$$

This is a version the scenario envisioned by Delbrück and Kuryłowicz, on a reduced scale that significantly reduces the theoretical burden. Because there are formal and semantic commonalities between the models of accent shift and the innovated forms, it seems more appropriate to regard the extension as proportional analogy, albeit on a somewhat abstract level.

It may also be that the accent of *paré* has nothing to do with accent shift in thematic adjectives at large, and everything to do with the relationship between the adjectival stem *pára-* and certain indeclinable adverbs that are constructed from the same root. In terms of accent, *paré* contrasts with *pārā* ‘away’ and *pári* ‘around, away from,’ but it agrees with *parás* ‘distantly, beyond, furthermore’ (43×, II+). Pokorny misanalyzes *parás* as a form of *pára-* with adverbial accent shift, because it is indistinguishable in form from a thematic masculine nominative singular. It is surely an indeclinable adverb/preposition in adverbial **-es/-os* (cf. adv. *pur-ás* ‘before, in front of,’ *pur-á* ‘earlier, before’),¹⁹⁷ but his error is suggestive. Adverbial *paré* ‘in the distance’ could be innovated as a locative case variant of a *parás*, if the latter were ever synchronically perceived as a masculine adjective. Adnominal use of the adverb encourages this type of reanalysis:

¹⁹⁷ EWA II 88, and references.

(120) *paráh sáh astu tanvā tánā ca* (VII.104.11a)

‘Let **him** be **far in the distance**, along with his life and lineage’

5.5.3 *sanāt*

It is difficult to dismiss what certainly appears to be accent shift in *sanāt* ‘from of old, always’

21×, II+ (: *sána-* ‘old’ < **séno-*, cf. Gk. ἔνος, OIr. *sen*).¹⁹⁸

índram ajuryám jaráyantam ukṣítám
sanāt yúvānam ávase havāmahe (II.16.1cd)

‘we call upon Indra for help—himself unaging but causing to age, a full-grown youth **from of old.**’

The form *sánā* (III.54.9, V.75.2) is often produced to show that a case-form of *sána-* ‘old’ may be used adverb, without accent shift. In this role, it is taken to be an instrumental meaning ‘always, perpetually.’ However, it is not certain that *sánā* actually derives from *sána-* at all. Jamison & Brereton follow Geldner in taking *sánā* from the verbal root \sqrt{san} ‘win’ in V.75.2,¹⁹⁹ and there is yet another competing theory that *sánā* is formed in an adverbial suffix *-nā*.²⁰⁰ In the end, it likely has no bearing on the accent of adverbial *sanāt*.

Hirt (1929: 286) explains *sanāt* as a retention, claiming that Ved. *sána-* originated as an oxytone stem *saná-* ‘old’ that was later accentually remodeled under the influence of *náva-* ‘new’ (< **néuo-*, cf. Gk. νέος). Taking the barytone accent of *sána-* to be a recent development, he is able to view adverbial *sanāt* as a fossilized adverbial retention from before the change of accent in the stem took effect. It is a tidy solution, but Hirt’s only evidence for original oxytone

¹⁹⁸ AiG II/2 102, EWA II 695

¹⁹⁹ *atyāyātam aśvinā, tiráh víśvāḥ ahám sánā*

‘Journey here, Aśvins, beyond and across all those “**I shall win**”-s.’

²⁰⁰ See references in AiG II/2, pg. 739.

accent in **saná-* is the adverb itself, and his theory for this particular form has not been widely accepted.

Pairs such as *ádharāt* : *adharát* and *úttarāt* : *uttarát* establish a pattern of accent shift in adverbial ablatives, but they do not align particularly well with *sanát* semantically. *adharát* (7×, VI+) and *uttarát* (4×, VI+) also appear to be comparatively recent innovations in contrast to *sanát* (21×, II+), which in fact occurs more frequently than any other thematic case-form with ‘accent shift’ in the RV. It has more in common with *aparám/-āya* and *paré* semantically, but not to a compelling degree. Where this leaves us is anyone’s guess. At this point I have no alternative solution to offer in this case. Hopefully by giving greater context to the question of accent in *sanát*, I have at least established that it requires further investigation, and that the traditional analysis must be met with skepticism.

5.6 Conclusion

In some ways, adverbial case-forms from thematic stems present the most convincing evidence of ‘adverbial accent shift’ in the Vedic grammar. With many of the forms in this chapter, there is a correlation between oxytone accent and adverbial function, but it can be explained without making the over-generalization that there is a productive process of accent shift in Vedic that is predicated on an abstract [+adverb] feature. Adverbial accent shift in thematic case-forms is restricted both formally (e.g. to instrumentals in *-ā*, never *-ena*) and semantically (to adjectives of direction). There is no explanation for the distributional restrictions, if adverbial accent shift is conceived of as a unified process that applies to case-forms of various stem types throughout the language, which share no discernible formal or semantic commonalities. I have made a case that the numerous thematic adverbs in *-á* are derived by suffixation, and that accent shift in further forms can be motivated by analogy to specific models. This explains why we do not see

adverbial accent shift applied indiscriminately to a broader range of thematic case-forms. It is not inaccurate, descriptively, to use the term ‘adverbial accent shift’ in reference to situations where the accent of certain case-forms in adverbial use is moved rightward analogically. But it is a mistake to equate analogical ‘shift’ in thematic adverbs with unconnected accentual phenomena elsewhere in the language, and it is also a mistake to conceive of adverbial accent shift as an autonomous process, when it is linked with specific morphology.

CHAPTER 6

LEFTWARD ACCENT SHIFT

At this point, ‘adverbial accent shift’ should be regarded with skepticism. Various morphologically unrelated adverbial case-forms scattered throughout the language do have synchronically irregular accent, when compared to non-adverbial case-forms of the same stem. Taken together, they give the descriptive impression of ‘adverbial accent shift.’ In a sense, however, it is an all-or-nothing proposition. If adverbial accent shift is called into question or disproven in enough of the exemplary forms, at a certain point whatever examples remain no longer create a descriptive, language-wide pattern that is sufficiently robust to justify its existence in the grammar.

All proposed cases of adverbial accent shift in previous chapters are alike in two respects: accent shift has been identified in case-forms of *adjectival or pronominal* stems, and the direction of accent shift has been uniformly *rightward*. This chapter deals with the comparatively small group of case-forms that show a descriptively leftward shift of accent in adverbial use. The majority of these appear to be instrumental root-nouns. In terms of both stem type and direction of accent shift, they are unlike any of the adverbs encountered in previous chapters, and yet they are frequently compared with them side-by-side as products of a unified accentual phenomenon. Definitive accentual solutions remain elusive for some of the forms in this chapter. For the present purposes, I am more concerned with describing their form and function both individually and collectively, in order to question the traditional assumptions. I contend that the forms within this group show divergent behaviors that make them difficult enough to equate with each other, let alone with rightward-shifting adverbs of other stem types that share no similarities beyond irregular accent and a vague notion that they function adverbially.

In §6.1, I critique the notion that adverbial accent shift is contrastive, which has been proposed as a way to unify leftward and rightward examples under the same umbrella term. In sections §6.2–§6.3, I survey the case-forms of root-nouns where adverbial accent shift has been identified. In section §6.4, I cover three additional purported cases of leftward adverbial accent shift, from unrelated stem-types. While I cannot offer conclusive explanations for every apparent case of accent shift, I conclude in §6.5 that over-reliance on a theoretically contrastive ‘adverbial accent shift’ process does more harm than good, inasmuch as it forestalls further inquiry into more substantial reasons for the surface accent of these forms.

6.1 ‘Contrastive’ accent shift

Adverbial case-forms with irregular accent within their synchronic paradigm make up a wide-ranging group of forms with no universally shared features. The resulting consensus is that practically any case-form that functions adverbially can be targeted for accent shift, as if by virtue of a suppositious [+adverb] feature.²⁰¹ However, the vast majority of case-forms in adverbial use are indistinguishable from regular case-forms, even accentually. By necessity, therefore, ‘adverbial accent shift’ is deemed **optional**. Even Delbrück (1893) and Kuryłowicz (1952), who rightly regard some forms with adverbial accent as fossilized retentions rather than innovations, still partially subscribe to this view. They both hold that fossilized adverbial case-forms that differ in accent from their synchronic paradigm established a pattern of accent shift, which could subsequently be applied to further adverbial case-forms—seemingly at random. Little effort has been made to identify environmental or intrinsic factors that might make one

²⁰¹ The handbooks follow Brugmann (KG 447)’s distinction between case function and adverbial use: “Von diesen Adverbien ist wieder 1) der grössere Teil als ‘erstarrte’ nominale oder pronominale Kasus zu erkennen, z.B. att. οἴκοι ποῖ lat. *domī hī-c* als Lok.Sg. Die Erstarrung besteht darin, dass für die bestimmte Funktion, die die Form als solche hat, das Sprachgefühl aufhört lebendig zu sein, dass es aufhört Substantiv und Adjektiv, Genera, Numeri oder Kasus zu unterscheiden. Die betreffende Funktion wird nur bei einer bestimmten Anzahl von Formen rein gedächtnismässig beibehalten und kann nicht mehr jedem beliebigen Nomen neu beigelegt werden. Adverbia die aus Adjektiven hervorgegangen sind, beruhen immer auf substantivischem Gebrauch derselben.”

case-form susceptible to adverbial accent shift, but leave another unaltered.²⁰² It is a minor break with tradition even to point out specific analogical models for individual adverbs with ‘shifted’ accent, even though analogy should be an obvious avenue of investigation for a process that applies irregularly.

Adverbial accent shift is also deemed **contrastive** rather than strictly uni-directional, at least when the label is expedient. Lanman (1880) and Schmidt (1888) popularize the idea that adverbial accent shift encompasses not only the rightward shift typical of the vast majority of cases, but at the same time also leftward shift in a much smaller group of forms. Taking his cue from Schmidt, Oldenberg (1901: 278f.) prescribes: “Der Accentwechsel der Adverbia besteht nicht nur in der Oxytonirung von Barytonis sondern auch in der Barytonirung von Oxytonis.” The statement is purely descriptive, but it encourages the perception that adverbial accent shift is a language-wide, unified and productive phenomenon that targets a functional category, rather than certain stem types or individual lexical items. The idea has been tacitly or explicitly assumed in the literature ever since.²⁰³ Lanman (1880: 585) points to *dīvā* as the only certain example of adverbial retraction of accent, and suggests that instrumentals *gūhā* and *tānā*, genitive *kṣāpas*, and an accusative deverbal *u*-stem adjective *didṛkṣu* may be further examples. Others have added *nt*-participle *ṛdhat* (Oldenberg: *ibid.*), inst. *mṛṣā* and *sācā* (Macdonell VG 428), pronominal *sīmā* (Schmidt: 1888: 205), and initial compound members *dhūrā*- (Hoffmann 1960: 246) and *kṣāpā*- (Scarlata 1999: 303).

²⁰² There are rare and half-hearted exceptions. Lanman (1880: 358) claims “The adverbial shifting of accent is natural in the homophonous instrumentals, since it differentiates them from the nominatives of the same form.” He does not explain why accent shift should be the method of distinction, but he does at least attempt to explain why a certain group of adverbial case-forms is particularly motivated to undergo some sort of modification, based on factors specific to the forms concerned.

²⁰³ AiG II/1 21, Renou (1952: 327), and Pinault (1985: 347) explicitly comment on the bi-directionality of adverbial accent shift. Others like MacDonnell (1910: *passim.*) and Gotō (2013: 148) cite forms with leftward and rightward shift without comment. Most often, bi-directionality is taken for granted by authors who invoke leftward adverbial accent shift *a priori* to account for a single adverbial form in isolation.

(121) PROPOSED EXAMPLES OF LEFTWARD ACCENT SHIFT

- a. *dívā*, inst. sg. ‘by day’ 25×, V+ (: *dív*, m./f. ‘day, heaven’)
kṣápas, gen. sg. ‘by night’ I.44.8, II.2.2 (: *kṣap*, f. ‘night’)
tánā, inst. sg. ‘continually, in succession’ ~10×, RV (: *tan-*, f.(?) ‘continuation, progeny’)
gúhā, inst. sg. ‘in secret’ 53×, II+ (cf. *gúh-*, f. ‘hiding’)
mṛṣā, inst. sg. ‘in vain, incorrectly’ I.179.3 (cf. **mṛṣ-*)
sácā, inst. sg. ‘together (with)’ 81×, II+ (cf. **sac-*)
kṣápā-, inst. sg. ‘at/by night(?)’ in *kṣápāvant-* 3×, III+
dhurā-, inst. sg. ‘violently’ in *dhurāduram* ŚB X.5.2.12
- b. *ṛdhat*, acc. sg. ‘prosperously(?)’ VI.2.4 (: *ṛdhánt-* ‘prospering’)
didṛkṣu, acc. sg. ‘with a desire to see’ VII.86.3 (: *didṛksú-*, adj. ‘desiring to see’)
simā inst. sg. ‘everywhere(?)’ VIII.4.1 (: *simá-*, prn. ‘every, all(?)’)

If adverbial accent shift is understood to be productive and contrastive, it can be employed to account for any and all accentual abnormalities in adverbs, without restraint. At the same time, all exceptions and inconsistencies are conveniently excused because it is also ‘optional.’ Being purely descriptive in nature, adverbial accent shift is defined so broadly as to be meaningless. In previous chapters, I have noted patterns of distribution within morphological subgroups of ‘accent-shifted’ adverbs, which literature on the topic routinely fails to recognize as significant.²⁰⁴ There are notable gaps in the inventory of adverbs with (supposed) leftward accent shift, as well.

As noted above, leftward adverbial accent shift is predominantly observed in adverbial instrumentals of root-nouns. Under normal circumstances, monosyllabic consonant stems show paradigmatic accent mobility, shifting the accent from the root to the ending in weak cases. In

²⁰⁴ In chapter §1, for instance, I note that adverbial accent applies selectively to certain *-vát* adverbs from barytone stems, and affects neither underlyingly suffix-accented *dyumát*, *revát* nor barytone *krátumat*, *sáhasvat*, etc. (despite the fact that Whitney projects ‘accent shift’ on the *-vát* suffix to an early stage, and these are all old forms). I also note in chapter §2 that the two main examples of *nt*-participles with accent shift share a close semantic relationship. In chapter §5, I note that thematic case-forms with ‘accent shift’ are restricted to adjectives of location/direction and that adverbs in inst. *-á* are disproportionately common. In all cases, I have taken the distributional restrictions to reflect an independent cause for the synchronic appearance of accent shift, which then propagates on a limited scale by analogy.

the forms under (§121a), the accent exceptionally remains on the root. However, Lanman is quite correct to be hesitant about claiming ‘adverbial accent shift’ in all examples except *divā*, which is the only one in the list that shows a clear accentual contrast with a robustly attested paradigm. All other forms under (§121) are plagued by serious complications of analysis, and there are already competing theories for over half of the forms without any additional contribution on my part. ‘Adverbial accent shift’ in *ýdhat* and *símā* in particular has been rejected in more recent literature (see §6.4 below). This leaves leftward accent shift restricted, for all practical purposes, to a few outliers of a single stem type. If ‘contrastive’ adverbial accent shift truly operates upon adverbs throughout the language, even optionally, we could reasonably expect to find a greater variety of leftward-shifting examples. Their total absence from the thematic declension is most conspicuous.

Traditionally, ‘adverbial accent shift’ has been treated as a legitimate cause of irregular accent, when in reality it has only ever been a descriptive generalization. The unfortunate consequence is that, given competing morphological analyses of a given form with irregular accent, ‘adverbial accent shift’ is regarded as equally plausible or even preferable to other potential explanations. I contend to the contrary that, all things being equal, an analysis that relies on a hypothetical ‘adverbial accent shift’ is inferior to one that explains the location of accent in more tangible terms. In other cases, the availability of ‘adverbial accent shift’ as an over-powered explanatory tool forestalls the investigation into viable alternatives. Where *dhúrrā-* and to a lesser extent *kṣápā-* are concerned, accent shift is actively projected into adverbial forms even when the circumstances do not demand that the accent be addressed at all.

The contrastive notion wildly overgenerates and ultimately must be abandoned, in my view. The semantic and syntactic characteristics of adverbs with leftward accent shift are

diverse, even if we consider oblique root-nouns in isolation. In the past, the divergent properties of ‘accent-shifted’ adverbs have been the main reason for generalizing the process into abstraction. If case-forms are targeted for accent shift because they function adverbially, it is not a problem that their properties are dissimilar overall in every other regard. However, having raised arguments against all types of rightward adverbial accent shift in previous chapters, we can no longer assume *a priori* that adverbial accent shift operates productively on a large scale, let alone that leftward and rightward cases can be unified as part of the same morphologically-indiscriminate accentual process. It seems more likely to me that they are individual oddities with idiosyncratic accentual phenomena at work. In the following sections, I present individually each adverbial case-form with purported leftward accent shift, pointing out their functional differences and, where possible, offering alternative analyses.

6.2 Adverbial accent in established root-nouns

dívā, *kṣápas*, and *tánā* derive from root-nouns with other case-forms for comparison. They have in common that the dubious distinction between ‘adverbial’ and non-adverbial function does not seem to be the only distinguishing factor between case-forms with and without a shift of accent. *dívā* ‘by day’ has a specialization in meaning that accompanies the dislocation of accent. *kṣápas* and *kṣapás* ‘by night, through the night(s)’ are functionally interchangeable, and more likely accusative plural than genitive singular. The entire paradigm of *tan-*, f. ‘continuance, progeny’ maintains root accent; inst. *taná* X.93.12 is the exception rather than the rule.

6.2.1 *dívā*

dívā ‘by day’ (25×, V+) is cited more often than any other form to demonstrate that adverbial accent shift may cause leftward retraction of accent, in addition to the more common oxytonesis.

dívā is relatively common and indisputably adverbial, and it forms an accentual minimal pair with inst. sg. *divá* ‘through heaven’ (9×, III+) that has the regular ending-accent shared by all weak case-forms of the paradigm of *dív-* ‘day, heaven.’

dívā ‘by day’ occurs almost exclusively with its antonym *náktam* ‘by night.’ The pair forms a parallel structure (i.e. ‘x by day, y by night’) 16 times, either within the same pāda or across two pādas. *dívā náktam* ‘by day and by night’ occurs as a unit in the pāda-initial position a further 6 times, and once more with an intervening negative particle *ná*.

- (122) *yáḥ naḥ dívā dípsati yáḥ ca náktam* (VII.104.11d)
 ‘whoever wishes to cheat us **by day** and whoever **by night**.’
- (123) *vayám u tvā dívā suté*
vayám náktam havāmahe (VIII.64.6ab)
 ‘We **by day** at the pressing and we **by night** call upon you’
- (124) *dívā náktam śárum asmát yuyotam* (VII.71.1d)
 ‘**By day** and **during the night** keep the arrow away from us’
- (125) *dívā ná náktam palitáḥ yúvā ajani* (I.144.4c)
 ‘the gray youth was born **by day**, not **by night**’

náktam is replaced as the antonym of *dívā* twice: by *aktaú* ‘by night’ and by *ávasā* ‘in the evening.’ *dívā* occurs entirely without an antonym only once, in I.38.9.

- (126) *rudrám dívā vardháyā rudrám aktaú* (VI.49.10b)
 ‘strengthen Rudra **by day**, Rudra **by night**’
- (127) *dívā abhipitvé ávasā ágamiṣṭhā* (V.76.2c)
 ‘as the best who come with help **by day** and **at the evening mealtime**’
- (128) *dívā cit támaḥ kṛṇvanti* (I.38.9a)
 ‘Even **by day** they create darkness’

divá ‘in heaven’ also regularly appears in a pair with its own antonym *pr̥thivyá* ‘on earth,’ and once with *bhūmi* ‘on earth.’²⁰⁵ It shows a wider variety of instrumental behaviors than *dívā*, including being the object of a preposition (4×).

(129) *sajóṣau indrāvarunā marúdbhiḥ*
dívā pr̥thivyá śṛṇutam hávam me (III.62.2cd)

‘Indra and Varuṇa, in concert with the Maruts, **with Heaven and with Earth**, listen to my call’

(130) *ná tát dívā ná pr̥thivyá ánu manye*
ná yajñéna ná utá sám̐bhiḥ ābhíḥ (VI.52.1ab)

‘**Not by Heaven nor by Earth** do I concede this, not by my sacrifice and not by these ritual labors’

(131) *dívā yānti marútaḥ bhūmyā agníḥ* (I.161.14a)

‘The Maruts travel **through heaven**, Agni **along the earth**’

(132) *samáḥ dívā dadṛśe rócamánaḥ* (VII.62.1c)

‘Radiating, he is visible as the equal **to heaven.**’

A case could be made that *divá* is adverbial in one or two cases, as for instance in I.161.14 (cf. Geldner: ‘*Am Himmel gehen die Marut, auf der Erde Agni*’). However, it must be allowed that there is certainly a functional divide between *dívā* and *divá*, and that of the two forms *dívā* is indisputably and exclusively adverbial. Still, adverbial accent shift does not fully account for the lexicalized semantic distinction that accompanies the dislocation of accent. No other purported case of adverbial accent shift is complicated by a clear semantic distinction of this kind. It is interesting, though not in itself an explanation, that the frequent collocations *divá/pr̥thivyá* and *dívā/náktam* both have constituent antonyms with matching accent.

²⁰⁵ *divá* occurs in the same pāda with *pr̥thivyá* 5×, with *bhūmi* 1×, and without an antonym 3× (I.163.6, VII.62.1, VIII.6.30).

Delbrück (1893: 543) claims that *dívā~divá* gives no reliable proof of ‘adverbial’ retraction of accent, since accent retraction is known to occur in other oblique root-nouns that cannot be considered adverbs. He compares *dívā* to inst. sg. *gávā* (: *gó-*, m./f. ‘cow’), which in fact has root accent throughout the whole paradigm. Right away this presents a problem: the two are not directly comparable, because *gávā* is regular within its paradigm, whereas *dívā* is an outlier when compared to other oblique case-forms in the same stem. That the fixed accent of *gó-* is secondary, we can surmise by comparison with Gk. βόος, βοί, etc. Wackernagel-Debrunner trace the fixed accent to gen./abl. sg. *góh*, whose resemblance to a form of a *u*-stem induced a change **gavé > gáve*, through the analogy *uróh : uráve* (etc.) :: *góh : x*.²⁰⁶ The accent of *góh* and *gáve* was subsequently leveled throughout the paradigm. Debrunner further proposes that the accent of *gáv-* influenced that of ved. *dyávi*, etc. It is not possible to propose the same explanation for *dívā*, nor do I see how the accent of *dyávi*—coincidentally from the same stem—could have any particular influence on the accent of just this single specialized form.

As of this point, I have no superior explanation to offer for the accent of *dívā*, but I caution against being satisfied with ‘adverbial accent’ as anything more than a descriptive label. Its circumstances are unlike any other case of (apparent) adverbial accent shift, even among other root-nouns with ‘leftward shift’ in this chapter.

6.2.2 *kṣápas* and *kṣápā-*

kṣápas (8×, II+) and *kṣápás* (5×, IV+) are the most common forms of the root-noun *kṣáp-*, f. ‘night.’ The only other forms to appear in the RV are inst. sg. *kṣapā́* (IX.99.2), gen. pl. *kṣapām*

²⁰⁶ AiG III 22.

(III.49.4), and an irregularly formed inst. pl. *kṣapābhis* (IV.53.7).²⁰⁷ The accentual distinction between *kṣapás* and *kṣápas* does not correlate clearly with a distinction in either case or function.

Grassmann interprets *kṣápas*, with root accent, both as a genitive singular (I.44.8, II.2.2) and as an accusative plural (I.64.8, I.116.4, VI.52.15, VII.15.8, VIII.41.3, X.77.2). He also takes *kṣapás*, with ending accent, as a genitive singular (VIII.19.31, I.79.6), an accusative plural (IV.16.19, VIII.26.3), and once as a nominative plural (I.70.7). Under Grassmann’s analysis, the genitive may be adverbial ‘by night’ whether it is accented on the root or on the ending. The root-accented accusative plural may function as an adverb meaning ‘through the nights,’ but it may also be a simple direct object. It is Lanman (1880: 482) who raises—and rejects—the possibility that root-accented *kṣápas* is best explained by adverbial accent shift: “If *kṣápas* I.44.8, II.2.2 be gen. sg. ‘by night,’ we may consider the accent as adverbially recessive; but in I.44.8, it is better taken as f. acc. pl., ‘through the nights’ and in II.2.2, as object of *á bhāsi*.” Geldner follows Grassmann for the most part, except in II.2.2 where he agrees with Lanman’s reappraisal.

(133) *agním vyūṣṭiṣu kṣápaḥ |*
kāṇvāsaḥ tvā sutāsomāsaḥ indhate (I.44.8bc)

‘**Through the nights**, when the dawns break, the Kaṇvas, their soma pressed, kindle you, Agni’

(134) *abhi tvā náktīḥ uśásaḥ vavāṣire*
agne vatsám ná svásareṣu dhenávaḥ
diváḥ iva ít aratīḥ mānuṣā yugá
á kṣápaḥ bhāsi puruvāra saṃyátaḥ (II.2.2)

‘Towards you have the nights and the dawns bellowed, o Agni, like milchcows in good pastures to their calf. / As the spoked wheel of heaven [=sun] (does) through the human (life-)spans, **through the successive nights** you shine, o you of many favors.’

²⁰⁷ See EWA I 424

Thomson (1891: 36f.) is convinced that adverbial accent shift must figure into the accent retraction of *kṣápas*, but he admits that (a) *kṣapás* can have the same adverbial meaning and function, and (b) in II.2.2, *kṣápas* must be accusative. He concludes that the accentual variability originally comes about by adverbial accent shift in genitive *kṣápas*. The correlation between adverbial function and accent retraction was subsequently lost, or else the accentual distinction was not completely carried out in the first place. Thomson’s scenario undermines the few fragile diagnostics we have for identifying ‘adverbial accent shift,’ if adverbial accent can be found even in non-adverbial forms.

At any rate, we need not take such extreme measures to account for the interchangeability of *kṣápas~kṣapás*. Jamison & Brereton opt for the accusative plural interpretation in every instance, which requires no special pleading. *kṣap-as* can be construed with an accusative plural adjective six times; a further three times it is in a parallel construction with acc. pl. *usrās̄* ‘ruddy (dawn)’ and once with acc. pl. *uśásas* ‘dawns.’ In I.44.8, J&B take *kṣápas* parallel to loc. pl. *vyùṣṭiṣu* ‘at the daybreaks’ rather than its object, despite the case disharmony, which is also observed between *kṣapás* and *vástuṣu* ‘at the dawns’ in VIII.19.31.²⁰⁸ This leaves only I.64.8, where *kṣápas* is universally taken to be the object of a participle *jínavantas*.

(135) *tvám mahīnām uśásām asi priyáh*
kṣapáh vástuṣu rājasi (VIII.19.31cd)

‘You are dear to the great dawns; you rule [/shine] **through the nights** and at the dawns.’

(136) *kṣapáh jínavantáh pṛṣatībhiḥ ṛṣṭībhiḥ*
sám ít sabādhah śávasā áhimanyavah (I.64.8cd)

‘**Animating the nights**, urgently they (join) together with their dappled (mares), with their spears—those who have a snake’s fury in their strength.’

²⁰⁸ Jamison (comm. I.79.5 and VIII.19.31) addresses the choice of accusative plural over genitive singular.

If *kṣápas* and *kṣapás* alike are accusative plural forms, they show a kind of accent variation that has a number of parallels. Accent variation in the accusative plural of monosyllabic stems, without change of meaning or usage, is by no means idiosyncratic to this root. Monosyllabic stems are regularly accented on the ending in weak cases, but the accusative plural differs in this regard:

[T]he accusative plural has its normal accentuation, upon the ending, in only a minority (hardly more than a third) of the stems: namely in *datás*, *pathás*, *padás*, *nidás*, *apás*, *uśás*, *jñāsás*, *pumśás*, *pāsás*, *mahás*; and sometimes in *vācás*, *srucás*, *hrutás*, *sridhás*, *kṣapás*, *vipás*, *durás*, *iśás*, *dviśás*, *druhás* (beside *vācas* etc.).²⁰⁹

If Jamison & Brereton are correct to analyze *kṣápas* and *kṣapás* as accusative plurals, the fact that both forms may or may not function as adverbs is irrelevant to the accent ‘shift.’ The possibility that the form of *kṣápas* is brought about by an irregular adverbial shift of accent is only suggested in the first place because it happens to function adverbially, but it would not draw special attention otherwise.

Scarlata (1999: 303) sees an adverbial instrumental *kṣápā*, with shifted accent, as a possible base of the compound *kṣápāvant-* (III.55.17, VII.10.5, VIII.71.2). However, there is a general consensus it is a compound *kṣá-pāvant-* ‘earth-protector.’²¹⁰ A differently accented *kṣa-pāvant-* (I.70.5, X.29.1) is also attested, but it offers no support for adverbial accent shift. For comparison, instrumental singular *kṣapā́* and plural *kṣapā́bhis* both function in a comparable adverbial manner as well, and yet neither is marked as adverbial by a shift of accent.

(137) *ádha kṣapā́ páriṣkṛtaḥ*
vājān abhí prá gāhate
yádī vivásvataḥ dhíyaḥ
hárim hinvánti yātave (IX.99.2)

²⁰⁹ Whitney 131.

²¹⁰ see Jamison (2015: 163f.) and Jamison, comm. I.70.5.

‘And prepared **by night** [Ge: **bei nacht**], he plunges towards the prizes, when the insightful thoughts of Vivasvant impel him, the tawny one, to drive.’

(138) *sá nah kṣapābhiḥ áhabhiḥ ca jinvatu*
prajāvantam rayīm asmé sám invatu (IV.53.7cd)

‘Let him quicken us **through the nights and the days**. Let him speed wealth that brings offspring.’

6.2.3 *tánā*

The surface form *tánā* is highly ambiguous, and open to a number of interpretations. Grassmann lists *tánā* under three separate stems:

- as a thematic adjective *tána-* in the nom. du. ‘continual’ (VIII.25.2) and substantivized in the n. nom. pl. ‘offspring’ (IX.62.2);
- as a homophonous instrumental to *tánā-*, f. ‘offspring’ (III.25.1, III.27.9);
- as the instrumental singular of a root-noun *tán-*, f.(?) ‘continuation, progeny’ (19×).

The instrumental of the root-noun may or may not be used as an adverb, meaning ‘continually, at length’ or similar.²¹¹ The accent of *tánā* does not contrast with other case-forms in the paradigm of *tán-*, for the most part. The lone attested *tanā́* in X.93.12 is difficult to interpret; it is generally agreed that this hymn contains errors of transmission, rendering the accentual evidence unreliable.²¹² Apart from the instrumental, only dative *táne* (7×, II+) is attested. Lanman (1880: 479f.) proposes, “Since *tánā* is often used as an adverb, we may say that its accent has suffered an adverbial shift—here recessive; cf. *divā*, adv. from the inst. sg. *div-á*.” He interprets *tánā* as an adverbial instrumental ten times.

(139) *yajñéna vardhata jātávedasam*
agním yajadhvam havíṣā tánā girá (II.2.1ab)

²¹¹ On the interpretation of *tánā*, see Renou (1958: 63f.).

²¹² See Jamison & Brereton (2015: 1544) and references therein. Gotō (2013: 40, fn. 117)

‘With sacrifice increase Jātavedas; sacrifice to Agni with oblation, with song **at length**’

(140) *indra ā yāhi citrabhāno*
sutāḥ imé tvāyávaḥ
āṅvībhiḥ tánā pūtāsaḥ (I.3.4)

‘O Indra, drive here!—you of bright radiance. These soma-pressings here are seeking you, the ones purified **in full measure** by delicate (fingers).’

No one, to my knowledge, has endorsed Lanman’s suggestion regarding the accent. It is a purely theoretical explanation of convenience that has no real support from the other attested forms of the paradigm. Monosyllabic stems are ordinarily accented on the stem in the strong cases, and the ending in weak cases. In the previous section, it was noted that the accusative plural maintains root accent more often than not. There are also a number of instances in which weak case-forms are irregularly accented on the stem, which has nothing to do with whether or not they function as adverbs. Whitney (131) lists *tánā* among these, which also include *tāne*, *rāṅe* and *rāṅsu*, *svāni*, *vāṅsu* and *vānas* (in P.N. *Vānas-pāti*-) from root-nouns in *-an-*, and also *sādā*, *nādbhyas*, *vīpas*, *kṣāmi*, *sūrā* and *sūras*, *āṅhas*, and *bṛhas* (in *bṛhaspāti*). Oblique case-forms of root-nouns in *-an-* maintain fixed accent on the root with particular frequency. There are no forms of \sqrt{svan} ‘murmur’ or $\sqrt{raṅ}$ ‘joy’ with accent on the weak endings, although from \sqrt{van} ‘tree, wood’ are found inst. sg. *vanā* and gen. pl. *vanām* alongside loc. pl. *vāṅsu* (and perhaps also gen. sg. *vānasi*).²¹³ According to Schindler (1972: 22), the accent of *tán-* follows the suffixal *u*-stems.

6.3 Isolated instrumentals from verbal roots

It is understandable to make a claim of adverbial accent shift in forms like *dīvā* and *kṣāpas*, which are associated with relatively well-attested root-nouns *div-* ‘day’ and *kṣap-* ‘night,’ and even *tan-*

²¹³ AiG III 22f. and Schindler (1972: 43).

‘continuity.’ In the case of *gúhā*, *mṛṣā*, and *sácā*, the evidence for corresponding root-nouns is extremely limited, or questionable.

6.3.1 *gúhā* and *mṛṣā*

gúhā ‘in secret’ (53×, II+) is almost universally regarded as an instrumental root-noun with adverbial accent shift. Its accent contrasts with an instrumental *guhā́*, which is attested only in RV RV I.67.6 in a stylistic phrase *guhā́ gúham* ‘from hiding place to hiding place.’ These two case forms in I.67.6 are taken as evidence that *gúhā*—which makes an appearance in the following pāda, and earlier in the third verse of the same hymn—is a form of a genuine root-noun *guh-*, f.(?) ‘hiding place, concealment.’²¹⁴

- (141) *priyā́ padāni paśvāḥ ní pāhi*
*viśvāyuh agne **guhā́ gúham** gāḥ* (I.67.6)
*yāḥ īm cikēta **gúhā** bhāvāntam*
ā yāḥ sasāda dhārām ṛtāsya (I.67.7)

‘Protect the dear tracks of the livestock. During your whole lifetime, Agni, you go **from hiding place to hiding place.**’

‘He who perceives him gone **into hiding**, and who has taken his seat at the stream of truth—’

Inst. sg. *guhā́* and acc. sg. *gúham* show the paradigmatic accent mobility that would be expected of a root noun *gúh-*, but they also constitute the only evidence of that root noun’s existence. This evidence is not particularly strong, considering that they form a recognizable stylistic syntagm with parallels in *yudhā́ yúdam...purā́ púram* ‘battle to battle...fortress to fortress’ (I.53.7), *yajñéna yajñā́* ‘offering to offering’ (III.32.12), and *vṛkṣā́-vṛkṣam* ‘tree to tree’ (AV V.5.3). According to (Hoffmann 1960: 247), *guhā́ gúham* is comprised of a verb dependent accusative with an adnominal ‘sociative’ instrumental, originally meaning something more like ‘(you go) to a hiding place, by way of a hiding place.’ In this role, *guhā́ gúham* was predestined to be

²¹⁴ AiG III 116, Schindler (1972: 17).

understood as a pseudo-āmreḍita (‘hidden again and again’) to the adverb *gúhā* ‘hidden, concealed.’ Hoffmann explains that this syntagm is the starting point of the ‘*menāmenam*’ type, which becomes common in later Vedic. One example of this type is *dhurāduram* ‘again and again by force’ (ŚB). The simplex *dhurā* ‘violently’ (ŚB X.5.2.12) is also attested once. Regarding its accent, Hoffmann (1960: 246, fn. 1) hypothesizes “Als Instrumental eines Wurzelnomens wäre es *dhurá* zu akzentuieren, als Adverb aber, und das ist wahrscheinlicher, *dhúrā*, vgl. Instr. *divá*, *guhá*, aber Adv. *dívā*, *gúhā*.” Under the assumption that adverbial accent shift is a regular rule for instrumental root-nouns in adverbial use, he projects a shift of accent where there is no real evidence one way or the other.

Hoffmann uses *divá~dívā* and *guhá~gúhā* to demonstrate a general pattern of adverbial accent shift in instrumental root nouns, but functionally *dívā* and *gúhā* have very little in common. In fact, Hoffmann’s characterization of regular, ending-accented *guhá*—namely, as an adnominal sociative instrumental—could also be applied to every instance of so-called ‘adverbial’ *gúhā*. In 22 of 53 total attestations in the RV, *gúhā* is an ‘adverbial’ predicate with verbal roots (*ni-*) $\sqrt{dhā}$ and $\sqrt{kṛ}$, meaning ‘put/make with-hiding,’ or more colloquially ‘make hidden.’ Most often, *gúhā* is used with the passive participle (*ni-*)*hitám* (14×), but it can also be used with active finite forms of $\sqrt{dhā}$. Forms of $\sqrt{kṛ}$ with *gúhā* are exclusively active and finite.

- (142) *tvám agne áṅgirasō gúhā hitám*
ánu avindan śísriyāṅám vánevane (V.11.6ab)
 ‘You, Agni, did the Aṅgirasas find, though you **were hidden in secret**, resting in every piece of wood.’
- (143) *gúhā námāni dadhire párāṇi* (X.5.2d)
 ‘they have **placed in hiding** the highest names.’
- (144) *parikṣítoḥ támaḥ anyá gúhā akar* (I.123.7c)
 ‘Of the two that circle around, the one **has hidden** the darkness’

- (145) *yāḥ dāsam vārṇam ādharam gūhā ákar* (II.12.4b)
 ‘who has put the Dāsa tribe below and **hidden away**’

gūhā is also used in conjunction with *as/bhū* ‘being in hiding’ a total of 8 times; its use in I.67.7 above is representative. Once again, participial forms outnumber finite verbs. A further 10 times, *gūhā* is as a verbless predicate with *yát* ‘who (is) in hiding’ or *cit* ‘although (being) in hiding.’

- (146) *gūhā sántaṃ subhaga viśvadarśataṃ* (V.8.3c)
 ‘**being in hiding** yet visible to all, o you who bring good fortune’

- (147) *átha ékaṃ cakráṃ yát gūhā*
tát addhātáyaḥ ít viduḥ (X.85.16c)
 ‘But the one wheel **that is hidden**—that just the experts know.’

- (148) *vīlú cit ārujatnúbhiḥ*
gūhā cit indra váhnibhiḥ
ávindaḥ usríyāḥ ánu (I.6.5b)
 ‘Along with the (ritual-)conveyors [=Aṅgirasas] who break even the stronghold, o Indra, you discovered the ruddy (cattle) **even though in hiding.**’

In the remaining verses, *gūhā* can always be construed as adnominal, in apposition to the subject or object of the main verb. Although it is possible to take *gūhā* as an adverb of manner, ‘(do) secretly,’ I think the adnominal interpretation more fitting in light of how it is consistently used in the more common constructions.

- (149) *gūhā cárantam sákhībhiḥ śívébhiḥ*
diváḥ yahvībhiḥ ná gūhā babhūva (III.1.9cd)
 ‘Him who moves **in hiding** from his kind companions—(though) he was not **hidden** from the young women of heaven’

- (150) *ṛtásya padé ádhi dīdiyānam*
gūhā raghuṣyát raghuyát viveda (IV.5.9cd)
 ‘She (?) found it shining **hidden** in the track of truth, going quickly, quickstreaming.’

Compare the instrumental with ending accent in the phrase *guhá gúham gáh* ‘you go to a hiding place **by way of** [i.e. **with**] **a hiding place.**’ It is, if anything, more ‘adverbial’ (if such a quality can be ranked) than its root-accented counterpart, inasmuch as it is more closely associated with the verbal action rather than with a nominal participant. Circumstances do not particularly favor taking *guhá* and *guhám* to be old retentions that preserve the accent of the underlying paradigm. That the adverb *gúhā* appears in the same verse (in its regular predicate adnominal use) shows that the author is well aware of the accentual distinction. The hymn in question, moreover, contains a good deal of alliterative wordplay. Hoffmann explains that phrases like *guhá gúham* are synchronically transparent and analyzable. The phrase in I.67.6 could well be an artistic innovation on the model of *yudhá yúdham* and *purá púram*, also in book I (and from established root-nouns with fully attested paradigms), rather than an archaism representing an inherited root-noun *guh-*. If so, it is entirely likely that adverbial *gúhā* is the older form.²¹⁵

I am not the first to observe that *gúhā* is predominantly adnominal in function. Jasanoff (1978: 122f.) summarizes the uses of *gúhā*, and remarks on the syntactic overlap with the Latin “infinitive” in *-ē*:

The locution *gúhā dhā-* (*kr-*) resembles the Latin type *calefaciō, facit arē*, etc.; the use of *gúhā* with forms of *as-* and *bhū-* recalls Latin imperfects and futures like *calēbam* and *calēbō*. Only the Latin conjugated type in *-eō, -ēs, -et*, etc., lacks a precise equivalent in Vedic: its place is taken by the predicative use of *gúhā* without a copula...where the phrase *yád gúhā* (*gúhā yád*) is translationally equivalent to Lat. *quod latet* (< *latēre*).

The comparison of *gúhā* with *ē*-forms elsewhere takes on added interest when it is noted that the root **gheugh-* actually underlies an *ē*-stative in Baltic. Ved. *gúhati* (cf. also YAv. 1 sg. mid. *aguze* ‘I hid (myself)’, etc.) is cognate with Lith. *gūžti* ‘cover (with something warm)’; this verb in turn underlies a stative *gūžėti* (3 p. *gūža, gūži, gūžėja*) ‘lie (under something warm)’, typically used of young birds nestling beneath their mother. Clearly, it would be desirable to relate *gúhā* to the stative stem **ghugh-ē-* in some direct way.

²¹⁵ *pace* Schindler (1972: 17).

Jasanoff goes on to claim that the morphological analysis of *gúhā* is transparent: it is the instrumental singular in *-ā* (< **-eh₁*) “with adverbial accentuation.” He repeats the analysis in Jasanoff (2003a: 144f.), and takes predicate instrumentals in **-éh₁* of the *gúhā*-type, to which *mṛṣā* also belongs, as the point of origin of IE *ē*-statives. *mṛṣā* ‘in vain, incorrectly’ is usually offered the same analysis as *gúhā*,²¹⁶ but it is rarely held up as a prime example of adverbial accent shift because no other forms of the reconstructed root-noun **mṛs-* are attested, let alone an ‘unshifted’ instrumental *mṛṣā**. It is only found once in the RV, but is common in later Vedic. In I.179.3, it functions as a verbless adnominal predicate, mirroring one of the common uses of *gúhā*.

(151) *ná mṛṣā śrāntám yát ávanti devāḥ* (I.179.3a)
 ‘Not **in vain** is the labor that the gods help.’

Balles (2006: 3) critiques some elements of Jasanoff (2003a), but agrees on one relevant point: “*gúhā*, *mṛṣā* and *míthū* reveal themselves to be not syntactically conditioned instrumentals but adverbial forms by their adverbial accent (in contrast to the real instrumental *guhá* RV 1.67.6).” Jasanoff and Balles both assume that adverbial accent shift is a genuine process with real explanatory power, and Balles goes so far as to rely on it as a diagnostic tool.

Evidence of root nouns corresponding to *gúhā* and *mṛṣā* is weak or, in the latter case, non-existent apart from the accent. It strikes me as significant that the very cases of ‘leftward adverbial accent shift’ that lack strong associations with nominal roots, both do have strong associations with verbal roots \sqrt{guh} ‘hide’ (cf. *gúhati*, Lith. *gūžėti*) and $\sqrt{mṛs}$ ‘forget, neglect’ (cf. *mṛṣyate*, Hitt. *maršezzi*), respectively. Their verbal connection has not gone unnoticed. Zubatý (1894: 126) proposes that *gúhā* and *mṛṣā* were originally oxytone, and the isolated adverbs have

²¹⁶ e.g. by MacDonnell (1910: 428), Schindler (1972: 38).

received the root-accent of the corresponding verbs *gúhati* and *mṛṣati**; it is a difficulty for his theory, however, that the attested present stem of $\sqrt{mṛṣ}$ is not *mṛṣati** but *mṛṣyate*.²¹⁷ The connection with verb forms is fundamental to Jasanoff’s argument that the *gúhā*-type is a point of origin for \bar{e} -statives—but still he relies on adverbial accent shift to explain their accent retraction.

There is a straightforward alternative explanation for the root accent of *gúhā* (and *mṛṣā* too), if only we let go of the persistent notion that *guhá* is the more accentually-conservative form. In the past it has been suggested, for example by Grassmann, that *gúhā* and *mṛṣā* are homophonous \bar{a} -instrumentals of a supposed feminine nouns *gúhā*-, f. ‘Versteck’ and *mṛṣā*-, f. ‘Nachlässigkeit.’ Under Grassmann’s analysis, *gúhā* thus comes from a separate (but completely synonymous) stem from *guhá* and *guhám*, both of which he attributes to a feminine root noun *gúh*-. But there is no reason to insist that *gúhā* must come from a feminine noun stem. In all likelihood, we are simply looking at a barytone thematic noun *gúha*- meaning ‘hiding (place)’; inst. *gúhā* and acc. *gúham* are both consistent with this analysis. Among the attested forms, inst. *guhá* (*gúham*) in I.67.6 is the more likely innovation. Its accent has been remodeled after the similar constructions *yudhá yúdhām* and *purá púram*, which are both constructed with robustly-attested genuine root nouns *yúdh*-, f. ‘fight’ and *púr*-, f. ‘fortification.’ It is equally possible to

²¹⁷ We might bring into consideration the dative infinitive *pra-mṛṣe* ‘to be ignored’ III.9.2, whose accent corresponds with that of adverbial *mṛṣā*. Radical infinitives in the RV have been identified in dat. $-e$ (~60×), acc. $-am$ (~12×), abl./gen. $-as$ governed by prepositions (6×), and loc. $-i$ (~5×). Because locative infinitives are rare and practically indistinguishable in meaning from ordinary locatives of verbal nouns, MacDonnell (1910: 411) suggests that “they are preferably to be explained as simple locatives of verbal nouns.” He notes that there is similar ambiguity of analysis with certain accusative infinitives, which are not always easily distinguished from substantives. In the words of Whitney (1889: 313), “the constructions in question might pass as ordinary case-constructions of a somewhat peculiar kind.” No instrumental infinitives have been identified in the RV, in the radical stem or otherwise, but there is theoretically no impediment against such a construction. Could it be that *gúhā* and *mṛṣā* have simply not been recognized as such? From inf. $-mṛṣe$ (: *mṛṣyate*), we can tell that the accent is correctly placed to form an instrumental infinitive *mṛṣā*. Presumably the same would be true for *gúhā* (: *gúhati*).

suppose that *mṛṣā* is simply a form of a thematic stem *mṛṣa-* ‘neglect, vanity,’ as there are no comparanda for *mṛṣā* to sway the argument in either direction.

In the end, there is little or no functional overlap between the temporal adjunct *dīvā* and the functionally-adnominal *gūhā* and *mṛṣā*. Even if we limit the scope of ‘adverbial accent shift’ to instrumental root nouns, its definition must be expanded into abstraction in order to attributing all three of these forms to the same process.

6.3.2 *sácā*

MacDonnell (1910: 428) sees a comparable adverbial shift of accent in *sácā* ‘together (with)’ (81×, II+), from a supposed root-noun *sác-** from \sqrt{sac} ‘follow.’ If so, like *gūhā* and *mṛṣā* it is an isolated form; no other case-forms of the hypothetical root-noun surface. Debrunner (AiG II/2 545) groups *sácā* with thematic *-ca-* stems *uccá-*, *tiraśca-*, *paścá-*, *parācá-*, *nīcá-*, and *prācá-* (see §4.2.4). Its accent is different from the rest in this group, which are otherwise oxytone, but it would be difficult to justify the difference as an adverbial shift of accent, because all of these stems are exclusively used to make adverbs. Perhaps it is has been remodeled somehow under the influence of adv. *sádā* ‘continually, always’ (38×, II+). At any rate, there are a number of possible origins for a word of this shape, and it is difficult to make a case either for or against ‘adverbial accent shift’ without a firmer grasp on its underlying morphology.

6.4 Leftward adverbial accent shift in other stem types

I have only encountered the ‘leftward adverbial accent shift’ label applied to three forms that are not oblique case-forms of root-nouns. All three are hapaxes, and they share no mutual similarities in stem type or semantics.

6.4.1 *rdhát*

rdhat ‘prosperously(?)’, which appears only once in VI.2.4, has already been discussed in §2.1 in conjunction with adverbial *nt*-participles. Oldenberg (1901: 278f.) proposes that *rdhat* is a neuter singular accusative participle in adverbial use, and that it shows leftward adverbial accent shift from its underlying position in the participle stem *rdhánt-* (: \sqrt{rdh} ‘prosper, accomplish fortunately’). Two assumptions underlie Oldenberg’s claim. First, he assumes that accent shift is widespread among adverbial *nt*-participles, but this is not the case at all. I argue in chapter §2.2.1 that *dravát* ‘at a run’ is a fossilized *t*-stem abstract rather than a form of *drávant-* with accent shift. Aside from *dravát*, only *patayát* ‘in flight’ presents a convincing case of accent shift in *nt*-participles. Considering its close semantic relationship with *dravát* as a verb of motion, its accent is probably analogical, but the same explanation is not available for *rdhát*. Secondly, Oldenberg assumes that adverbial accent shift is contrastive, which allows him to apply it *ad hoc* to a form without any parallels. A leftward shift of accent makes *rdhat* exceptional among adverbial participles, which are vanishingly rare anyway. As a participle rather than a root-noun, it is likewise exceptional among cases of leftward accent shift.

Grassmann, Geldner, Jamison & Brereton,²¹⁸ and Lubotsky (1997) all analyze *rdhat* as a finite verb. Oldenberg himself acknowledges the possibility, but he dismisses it prematurely and without compelling criticism in favor of the participial analysis. The theoretical cost of analyzing *rdhat* as an adverbial participle is too high to justify, when other options are available.

6.4.2 *símā*

²¹⁸ Jamison (comm. VI.2.4) explains the irregular zero-grade root syllable in place of the expected full-grade **árdhat*.

The form *símā* occurs once in VIII.4.1. It differs in accent from the underlying stem *simá-* ‘(him)self,’ a reflexive pronominal stem that is only found in the masculine singular in the RV.²¹⁹ Böhlingk & Roth interpret *símā* as an adverbial feminine instrumental meaning ‘everywhere,’ misinterpreting *simá-* to mean ‘all, every’ based on a perceived connection with prn. *sama-*. Schmidt (1888: 105), Thomson (1891: 34), Hopkins (1893: 277), and Oldenberg (1909a: 79) accept the explanation with respect to both meaning and accent. The pair adj. *simá-* : adv. *símā* is one of the prime pieces of evidence that Schmidt uses to argue that adverbial accent shift is contrastive, and may involve barytonesis of underlying oxytones as well as the reverse.

Grassmann also (incorrectly) glosses *simá-* ‘all, every’ or ‘belonging to all,’ but he offers a new analysis of *símā* as a vocative, since the form in the Padapāṭha text is *símǎ* with a short final vowel. As a vocative, the retracted accent is justified by its position at the beginning of a pāda in VIII.4.1. He is followed by Lanman (1880: 339), who cites *hāriyojanā* (I.61.16) and *vṛṣabhā* (VIII.45.22,38) as comparanda for the lengthening of final *ā* in the vocative. Geldner (1897: 188ff.) reiterates the vocative analysis but argues for a reflexive interpretation of the stem, which is now standard.

(152) *yát indra prák ápāk údak*
nyàk vā hūyáse nṛbhiḥ
***símā** purú nṛṣūtaḥ asi ánave*
ási praśardha turváse (VIII.4.1)

‘When, Indra, you are being called forward or back, up or down, by men, **you yourself**, propelled by men are many times in the company of the descendants of Anu, are in the company of Turvaśa, you vaunter.’

The idea that *símā* is an adverbial form remains stubbornly persistent: Debrunner (AiG II/2 578) and Mayrhofer (EWA II 730) both correctly gloss the underlying stem *simá-* ‘selbst,’ yet they

²¹⁹ Pischel & Geldner (1897: 188ff.) explains the meaning and function the stem; see also AiG II 578.

still label *sīmā* as an adverb with adverbial accent shift. However, Jamison & Brereton favor the vocative analysis, as does Gotō (2013: 76). The accentual evidence strongly favors taking *sīmā* as a vocative, since it neatly eliminates the need to assume an external process of contrastive adverbial accent shift.

6.4.3 *didṛkṣu*

The analysis of *didṛkṣu* in VII.86.3 is much debated. That it is somehow associated with the desiderative stem of √*dr̥ṣ* ‘see’ is clear. It resembles a desiderative adjective in *-u*, but derived adjectives of this type are oxytone as a rule.²²⁰ Grassmann interprets it as masculine nominative singular of the desiderative adjective, albeit with wrong accent and wrong sandhi: that is, *didṛkṣūpa* for *didṛkṣus | ūpa*, with elision of the *s* and crasis with the initial word of the following pāda. Lanman (1880: 405f.) concludes that it is probably best to follow the Padapāṭha and take it as a neuter singular used adverbially, with adverbial shift of accent. Thomson (1891: 25f.), Oldenberg (1912: 59), MacDonnell (1917: 137), Renou (1952: 325) and recently Heenen (2006: 159) maintain the ‘adverbial accent shift’ explanation.²²¹

(153) *pr̥cché tát énaḥ varuṇa didṛkṣu | ūpa u emi cikitūṣaḥ vip̥ccham*
samānām ít me kaváyaḥ cit āhuḥ | ayám ha túbhyam vāruṇaḥ hṛñīte (VII.86.3)

‘I ask myself about this guilt, Varuṇa, **wanting to see**; I approach those who understand in order to inquire. Even the sage-poets say the very same thing to me: “Varuṇa now is angry with you.”’

²²⁰ AiG II/2 468.

²²¹ Oldenberg mentions *suhántu* in RV 7.19.4 as a comparable adverb derived from an adjective by accent shift. Heenen counters that the comparison is not correct, since unlike *didṛkṣu* the radical accentuation of *suhántu* is totally regular, compared to of similar compounds; such *suyántubhis* in RV V.44.4.

Lanman (1912: 372)²²² comments that the case-form and stem-form are entirely regular under Ludwig’s earlier interpretation, namely, that *didṛkṣu* is the masculine locative plural of a word *didṛṣ-* ‘seer,’ which in this verse means ‘among those who see.’ It has a parallel construction in German *bei Jemand anfragen*. In this verse, the speaker consults a plural group *cikitúṣaḥ* ‘those who understand,’ and receives his answer from *kaváyah* ‘the sage-poets.’ Considering the context, it is within the realm of possibility for the verse to commence *prcché* ‘I inquire’...*didṛkṣu* ‘among those who see.’ MacDonnell is probably correct to dismiss it as “a very improbable formation”; I am unaware of any similar cases where desiderative stems are used in this manner. However, I am also unaware of any other case of ‘adverbial accent shift’ that bears any resemblance to this particular example. *didṛkṣu* can only be explained as the result of adverbial accent shift if we must fall back on the assumption that adverbial accent shift is productive, bi-directional, and blind to stem type—none of which can be justified, at this point. I must leave a more satisfying explanation of *didṛkṣu* for others to resolve.

6.5 Conclusion

At this point a great deal of evidence for ‘adverbial accent shift’ has (hopefully) either been eliminated or rendered suspect, and it grows increasingly difficult to justify the assumption that it exists on a widespread level at all. In the absence of more satisfying analyses for every individual form in this chapter, it is not possible to dismiss the idea of ‘adverbial accent’ out of hand. It is a descriptive fact that *dívā* (the adverb), for example, can be distinguished from *divá* (the instrumental of the active paradigm) by a difference in the location of accent. It is not incorrect to refer to *dívā* as the form with adverbial accent. The notion of ‘adverbial accent shift’

²²² Lanman also reiterates the possibility that *didṛkṣu* is a masculine nominative singular of the desiderative adjective with elision and crasis, but notes that the accent is wrong. He neglects to mention his own earlier proposal that *didṛkṣu* may be a neuter accusative with accent shift.

becomes problematic when it is treated as an explanation of *why* the accent is not in its predicted position, rather than as a surface-level description of the form.

CONCLUSION

Previous literature has tended to approach adverbial forms with apparently ‘shifted’ accent from one of two extremes. On the one extreme, all of the disparate forms are brought together collectively in order to establish a general pattern of adverbial accent shift, without addressing the problems with that analysis at the individual level. At the other extreme, the claim of ‘adverbial accent shift’ is evaluated with respect to an individual form in isolation, without questioning the validity of the process in a wider context. If all of the diverse forms are to be accounted for under one unified theory of adverbial accent shift, the definition of that process must be expanded to the point that it wildly overgenerates. It is uneconomical to insist that ‘adverbial accent shift’ is productive and contrastive (i.e. bi-directional) in the language at large. Nor, considering the gaps in distribution, can it be assumed that adverbial case-forms are targeted for accent shift by virtue of ‘adverbial’ function alone, independently of formal and semantic characteristics.

There is a danger of too strictly standing by the conviction that adverbial accent shift never existed in any capacity. The large number of otherwise unrelated adverbs with accentual irregularities could indeed have eventually created a synchronic impression that some kind of adverbial accent shift process was active in the language. If that impression did arise within the Vedic period, it does not seem to have been grammaticalized to the point of productively shifting the accent of additional adverbs without regard to the morphological make-up of a particular target form. Adverbial case-forms with innovated accent displacement appear to have come about only by proportional analogy, which is limited to certain stem classes with identifiable analogical models. Putting the name ‘adverbial accent shift’ to an analogical scenario is more misleading than useful, even if it is descriptively more-or-less accurate. Individually, the

analyses I have presented in the preceding chapters are negotiable. Taken together, there is a greater take-away: at no point in Vedic can it be claimed that so-called ‘adverbial accent shift’ applies indiscriminately to case-forms with adverbial function. It is my hope that dispelling the longstanding myth of adverbial accent shift finally opens the door to the consideration of alternate analyses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Balles, Irene. 2006. The Old Indic *cvi* construction, the Caland system, and the PIE adjective. In Jens E. Rasmussen and Thomas Olander (eds.), *Internal Reconstruction in Indo-European. Methods, Results, and Problems. Section papers from the XVI International Conference on Historical Linguistics (Copenhagen, August 2003)*, 1–15. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Bartholomae, Christian. 1907. Zu den arischen Wörtern für ‘der erste’ und ‘der zweite.’ *Indogermanische Forschungen* 22: 95–116.
- Bartholomae, Christian. 1904. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Bartholomae, Christian. 1895. Vorgeschichte der iranischen Sprachen. In: Wilhelm Geiger and Ernst Kuhn (eds.), *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*, Vol. 1, 1–151. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Bartholomae, Christian. 1892. Arica I. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1(1): 178–193.
- Bartholomae, Christian. 1889. Arisches. In: Adalbert Bezzenger (ed.), *Beiträge Zur Kunde Der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, vol. 15, 1–43. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Beekes, Robert. 2010. *Etymological dictionary of Greek*. Leiden: Brill.
- Beekes, Robert S. P. 1988. *A Grammar of Gatha-Avestan*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bender, Harold H. 1910. *The suffixes mant and vant in Sanskrit and Avestan*. Baltimore: J. H. Furst.
- Benfey, Theodor. 1851. *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1953-1960. Göttingen: Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1935. *Origines de la formation des noms en Indo-Européen*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.

- Bopp, Franz. 1885. *A comparative grammar of the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic, German, and Slavonic languages*. 4th ed. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Brugmann, Karl. 1911. *Grundriss Der Vergleichenden Grammatik Der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, Vol. 2.2. 2nd ed. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Brugmann, Karl. 1904. *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg : K. J. Trübner.
- Buck, Carl Darling and Walter Petersen. 1970. *A reverse index of Greek nouns and adjectives: arranged by terminations with a brief historical introduction*. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Burrow, Thomas. 1955. *The Sanskrit language*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Cantera, Alberto. 2005. Adverbial-prädikative Adjektive im Indoiranischen. *Historische Sprachforschung* 118: 101–29.
- Collitz, Hermann. 1886. Die flexion der nomina mit dreifacher stammabstufung im Altindischen und im Griechischen. In: Adalbert Bezenberger (ed.), *Beiträge zur kunde der indogermanischen sprachen*, Vol. 10, 1–71. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- de Vaan, Michiel. 2003. *The Avestan vowels*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1893. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Vol. I. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1888a. *Altindische syntax*. Halle : Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1888b. *Syntaktische Forschungen*, Vol. 5. Halle : Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Debrunner, Albert. 1954. *Altindische Grammatik*, Band II,2. *Die Nominalsuffixe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Dunkel, George. 2000. The common origin of conjunctive **-k^he* and of adverbial **-s*. In: J. Narten et al. (eds.), *Anusantatyai: Festschrift für Johanna Narten zum 70. Geburtstag*, 11–29. Dettelbach: J. H. Röhl.
- Ernout, Alfred. 1949. *Les adjectives Latins en -ōsus et en -ulentus*. Paris: C. Klincksieck.
- Gaedicke, Carl. 1880. *Der accusativ im Veda*. Breslau: Wilhelm Koebner.
- Geldner, Karl Friedrich. 1951. *Der Rig-Veda aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen*. 3 volumes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gotō, Toshifumi. 2013. *Old Indo-Aryan morphology and its Indo-Iranian background*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Grassmann, Hermann. 1873. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Grestenberger, Laura. 2009. *The Vedic i-stems and internal derivation*. Master's thesis, Universität Wien.
- Greule, Albrecht. 2014. *Deutsches Gewässernamenbuch: Etymologie der Gewässernamen und der zugehörigen Gebiets-, Siedlungs- und Flurnamen*. Berlin & Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Griffith, Ralph T. H. 1916–17. *The hymns of the Atharva-Veda, translated with a popular commentary*. 2 vols. Benares: E. J. Lazarus.
- Heenen, François. 2006. *Le désidératif en védique*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Hirt, Hermann. 1929. *Indogermanische Grammatik*. Vol. 5. Der Akzent. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Hirt, Hermann. 1927. *Indogermanische Grammatik*. Vol. 3. Das Nomen. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

- Hirt, Hermann. 1895. *Der Indogermanische Akzent: ein Handbuch*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Hoffmann, Karl and Bernhard Forssman. 1996. *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1967. *Der Injunktiv im Veda*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1960. Der vedische Typus *menāmenam*. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 76: 242–248.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1957. Zwei vedische Wortsippen. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 10: 59–71.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1956a. Notizen zu Wackernagel-Debrunner, Altindische Grammatik II, 2. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 8: 5–24.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1956b. Altindische Präverbien auf -*ā*. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 1: 54–60.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1956c. Zum prädikativen Adverb. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 1: 42–53.
- Hopkins, Edward Washburn. 1893. Problematic passages in the Rig-Veda. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 15: 252–283.
- Hopkins, Edward Washburn. 1892. The Aryan future. *American Journal of Philology* 13(1): 1–50.
- Insler, Stanley. 1975. *The Gāthās of Zarathustra*. Leiden: Brill.
- Insler, Stanley. 1970. Sanskrit *tāskara-* and text criticism to AV. xix 47–50. *Die Sprache* 16(2): 38–48.

- Ittzés, Máté. 2013. Light verb constructions vs. simple verbs in Vedic: *vimócanam kr̥ṇute* (RV 3,30,12d). *CEENIS Current Research Series*, Vol. 1, 107–123. Warsaw: Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa.
- Jackson, A. V. Williams. 1893. On Avestan *ayōkhšusta** ‘molten metal,’ *ayah*, and its significance in the Gāthās. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 15: lviii–lxi.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. 2018. *Rigveda Translation: Commentary (ongoing)*. Retrieved from <http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> 18 February 2018.
- Jamison, Stephanie. 2015. Śleṣa in the Ṛg Veda?: Poetic Effects in Ṛg Veda X.29.1. *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 19: 157–170.
- Jamison, Stephanie. 1983. *Function and Form in the -āya-formations of the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. and Joel P. Brereton, trans. 2014. *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jasanoff, Jay. 2008. The accentual type **vèdō*, **vedeti* and the origin of mobility in the Balto-Slavic verb. *Baltistica* XLIII (3): 339–379.
- Jasanoff, Jay. 2003a. ‘Stative’ **-ē-* revisited. *Die Sprache* 43(2): 127–70.
- Jasanoff, Jay. 2003b. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jasanoff, Jay. 1978. *Stative and middle in Indo-European*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Keydana, Götz. 2013. *Infinitive im Ṛgveda: Formen, Funktion, Diachronie*. Leiden: Brill.
- Klein, Jared. Āmreḍitas and related constellations in the Rigveda. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 123 (4): 773–802.

- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2014. Proto-Indo-European “thorn”-clusters. *Historische Sprachforschung*, 127(1): 43–67.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert. 2000. Mittelpersisch. In: Bernhard Forssman and Robert Plath (eds.), *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik: Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 1997 in Erlangen*, 191–229. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert.
- Kuiper, F. B. J. 1947. Traces of laryngeals in Vedic Sanskrit. In: *India antiqua, a volume of Oriental studies presented by his friends and pupils to Jean Philippe Vogel, C.I.E. on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his doctorate*, 198–212. Leiden: Brill.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2017. The syntax of Indic. In: Jared Klein, Brian Joseph, and Matthias Fritz (eds.), *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics*, pp. 377–409. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kümmel, Martin. 2000. *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen: eine Untersuchung der Form und Funktion einer ererbten Kategorie des Verbums und ihrer Weiterentwicklung in den altindoiranischen Sprachen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1952. *L’accentuation des langues indo-européennes*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1935. *Études Indoeuropéennes*. Prace komisji językowej 21. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- Kurzová, Helena. 1993. *From Indo-European to Latin: the evolution of a morphosyntactic type*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lanman, Charles R. 1912. *A Sanskrit reader: with vocabulary and notes*. Boston: Ginn and Company.
- Lanman, Charles R. 1880. A statistical account of noun-inflection in the Veda. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 10: 325–601.
- Lowe, John J. 2015. *Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit: the syntax and semantics of adjectival verb forms*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

- Lowe, John. 2014. Indo-European Caland adjectives in *-nt- and participles in Sanskrit. *Historische Sprachforschung* 127: 166–195.
- Lubotsky, Alexander. 2011. *Indo-Aryan inherited lexicon (in progress)*. Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Project, Leiden University.
- Lubotsky, Alexander. 1997. *A Ṛgvedic word concordance*. American Oriental Series, vol. 82–83. New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society.
- Lubotsky, Alexander. 1988. *The system of nominal accentuation in Sanskrit and Proto-Indo-European*. Leiden: Brill.
- MacDonnell, Arthur A. 1917. *A Vedic reader for students*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MacDonnell, Arthur A. 1916. *A Vedic grammar for students*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MacDonnell, Arthur A. 1910. *A Vedic Grammar*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1992. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. 2 vols. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1956–1980. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. 4 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1894. *Varia. Mémoires de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 8: 235–245.
- Migron, Saul. 1988. Living on in the son: RV X,10,1cd. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 49: 79–84.
- Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English dictionary: etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Nikolaev, Alexander. 2010. Hittite *mēnahhanda*. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 130(1): 63–71.
- Nishimura, Naoko. 2003. The Mantra *g(h)oṣad asi* in the Yajurveda. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 63: 109–119.
- Nussbaum, Alan. 2017. Agentive and other derivatives of “τόμος-type” nouns. In: Claire Le Feuvre, Daniel Petit & George-Jean Pinault (eds.), *Verbal Adjectives and participles in Indo-European languages*, 233–266. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- Nussbaum, Alan. 2016. Derivational properties of ‘adjectival roots’. Paper delivered at the 15th Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Vienna. September, 2016.
- Nussbaum, Alan. 2007. A property of “adjectival” roots in Indo-European. Paper delivered at the Twenty-Sixth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Yale University. June, 2007.
- Nussbaum, Alan J. 1986. *Head and horn in Indo-European*. New York and Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Olander, Thomas. 2015. *Proto-Slavic Inflectional Morphology: A Comparative Handbook*. Leiden: Brill.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1914. Zwei vedische Worte. In: *Festschrift Ernst Windisch zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag am 4. September 1914, dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern*, 116–122. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1912. *Rgveda: textkritische und exegetische Noten: Siebentes bis zehntes Buch*. Berlin: Weidmannsche.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1909a. *Rgveda: textkritische und exegetische Noten: Erstes bis sechstes Buch*. Berlin: Weidmannsche.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1909b. Vedische Untersuchungen. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 63(2): 287–302.

- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1901. Rgveda VI 1–20. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 55: 267–330.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1897. Vedic hymns, part II: hymns to Agni (mandalas I–V). In: F. Max Müller (ed.), *The sacred books of the east*, Vol. XLVI. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. Forthcoming. “About the compound type Vedic *vidád-vasu-* Avestan *vīdaṭ.gu-*.” In: Velizar Sadovski (ed.), *Iranian and Indo-European Onomastics and Linguistics. Symposium in the Memory of Manfred Mayrhofer*. Vienna, May 10th–12th, 2012.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1989. Reflets dialectaux en védique ancien. In: Collette Caillat (ed.), *Dialectes dans les literatures indo-aryennes*, 35–96. Paris: Collège de France, Institut de civilisation indienne.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1985. Emploi et analyse des adverbes comparatifs sanskrits en *-vát*. In: B. Schlerath (ed.), *Grammatische Kategorien: Funktion und Geschichte: Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, 340–369. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Pischel, Richard and Geldner, Karl F. 1897. *Vedische Studien*. Vol. 2. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Rau, Jeremy. 2009. *Indo-European nominal morphology: The decads and the Caland system*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Renou, Louis. 1958. *Études sur la vocabulaire du Rgveda*. Pondichéry: Institut Français d’Indologie.
- Renou, Louis. 1952. *Grammaire de la langue védique*. Paris-Lyon: IAC.
- Renou, Louis. 1936. Dénominateurs du Rgveda en *-aryati*, *-anyati*. *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 37: 17–36.
- Renou, Louis. 1938. Adverbs in *-taram*, *tarām*. *Indian Historical Quarterly* XIV: 121–136.
- Rix, Helmut. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

- Rix, Helmut. 1985. Das letzte Wort der Duenos-Inschrift. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 46: 193–220.
- Scarlata, Salvatore. 1999. *Die Wurzelkomposita im Ṛg-Veda*. Wiesbaden: Reichert. 303.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1972. *Das Wurzelnomen im Arischen und Griechischen*. Würzburg: Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Philosophischen Fakultät der Julius-Maximilians-Universität zu Würzburg.
- Schroeder, Leopold. 1879. Die accentgesetze der homerischen nominalcomposita, dargestellt und mit denen des Vedaverglichen. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 24(2): 101–128.
- Schulze, Wilhelm. 1883. Etymologisches. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 27: 603–607.
- Schmidt, Johannes. 1888. Die lateinischen Adverbia auf e von o-Stämmen und die Singular-dative der germanischen Pronomina. In: *Festgruss an Otto von Böhtlingk zum doktor-jubiläum, 3 februar 1888, von seinen freunden*, 100–106. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- Schmidt, Johannes. 1889. *Die Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra*. Weimar: H. Böhlau.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger. 1968. Die avestischen Adjektivstamme auf -anc-. In: *Pratidanami Indian, Iranian, and Indo-European studies presented to Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus Kuiper on his sixtieth birthday*, 134–141. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- Srinivasan, Doris Meth. 1997. *Many heads, arms and eyes: origin, meaning and form of multiplicity in Indian art*. Leiden: Brill.
- Thomson, Emil. 1891. *Zur Accentuation des Adverbes. Sonder-Abdruck aus dem Jahresbericht der Reformierten Schule*. St. Petersburg: R. Golicke.

- van Nooten, Barend A and Holland, Gary (eds.). 1994. *Rig Veda: a metrically restored text with an introduction and notes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wackernagel, Jakob. 1934. Indoiranica, 19. gAw. *darāṣaṭ*. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 61: 190–208.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1918. Indoiranisches. *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1918*: 380–411. (= *Kleine Schriften* vol. 1, pp. 299-330).
- Wackernagel, Jakob. 1910. Indoiranica, 1. Suffix *-mant-*. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 43(3): 277–288.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1930. *Altindische Grammatik*. Band III. *Nominalflexion–Zahlwort–Pronomen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1905. *Altindische Grammatik*. Band II,1. *Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposition*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1896. *Altindische Grammatik*. Band I. *Lautlehre*.
- Weber, Albrecht. 1858. Das Vâjasaneyi-Prâtiçâkhyam. *Indische Studien* IV: 65–170. Berlin: Ferd. Dümmler.
- Weiss, Michael. 2018. Veneti or Venetes? Observations on a widespread Indo-European tribal name. In: L. van Beek et al. (eds.), *Farnah: Indo-Iranian and Indo-European studies in honor of Sasha Lubotsky*, 349–358. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.
- Whitney, William D. 1889. *Sanskrit Grammar*. 2nd ed. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Whitney, William D. 1881. Index verborum to the published text of the Atharva-Veda. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 12: 1–383.
- Whitney, William D. 1870. On the nature and designation of the accent in Sanskrit. *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1869–1896)*, 20–45. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Zubatý, Josef. 1894. Baltische Miszellen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 3: 119–145.

INDEX OF FORMS

- aṅgirasvát* 10–14, 19, 29f.
atitarām 64
atrivát 10, 14
atharvavát 10, 17f.
adatrāyā 56–58; n. 58
adharā(-) 89, 108f., 114, 118, 121f.,
 126–128; n. 108, 118
adharāt 1f., 63, 108f., 112, 114,
 118–121, 131, 137; n. 65, 89, 119,
 131
anuṣṭhuyā 57
apatarām 64f., 133
aparām 65, 108, 111f., 114, 131–
 135, 137; n. 65, 134
aparāya 65, 111f., 132, 134f.; n. 65
apākā 74–77, 81, 86, 103, 105, 107;
 n. 78, 108
apākāt 1, 2, 64, 74–77, 81, 107
apnavānavát 10
amā 1, 3, 108, 114, 122–124; n. 123,
 125
amāt 109, 114, 122–124; n. 123
amuyā 1f., 57, 60
ayā 60f., 123f.; n. 123
avatarām 64–66
āśuyā 57, 60
āsayā 56, 58; n. 56, 94
īśāt 34f., 41, 46; n. 35f., 41
uccā 87, 98–103
uttarāt 40, 64, 108f., 112, 114, 118–
 122, 130, 137; n. 65, 119, 130
uttarām/-tarām 1, 63–65
upāké 61, 74–78, 86, 103, 105, 107;
 n. 78, 108
ubhayā 1, 3, 56, 59, 108, 110, 116f.,
 125f., 127, 129; n. 108, 110
ṛtayā 56–60, 62, 73; n. 110
īdhat 39f., 46, 141–143, 160; n. 39
ṛshivát 11, 19, 29
aurvabhṛguvát 10, 17; n. 29
kaṇvavát 10
kuhayā 56
kṣápas 141f., 144–150, 152
kṣápā- 5, 141–3, 147, 150
kṣmayā 56, 58, 62
gúhā 1, 5, 109, 141f., 153–159; n.
 112, 158
jamadagnivát 10
jānivát 11, 18, 29–31
jmayā 56, 62; n. 58
tánā 136, 141f., 144, 151f.; n. 151
tárat 38, 40, 45; n. 38
tiraścā 87, 98–102; n. 99
ṭṛpát 5, 34, 36f., 40f., 45; n. 37, 38,
 40, 41
dakṣiṇā 59, 64, 108, 110, 114–116,
 125f., 129f.
dakṣiṇé 54, 109, 111f., 114–116,
 130f., 134
didṛkṣu 6, 39, 141f., 162f.; n. 163
dívā 1–3, 40, 54, 64, 141f., 144–147,
 152, 154, 159, 163; n. 112
dyugát 5, 41
dravát 3, 5, 33–35, 37, 40–43, 45–54,
 160; n. 35, 41, 43, 48, 53, 112
drahyát 6, 34, 36f., 40f.; n. 41
dhūra-
dhṛśát 34, 37, 40f., 45; n. 38, 40, 41
dhṛṣṇuyā 57
natarām 64; n. 63
nabhākavát 10
naktayā 1, 3, 56–58, 61; n. 110
nitarām 64; n. 63
nīcā 1, 74, 86f., 91–98, 100–103,
 107, 113; n. 100
nṛvát 9–11, 15, 18f., 21–23, 27–29,
 32, 109; n. 10, 11, 13, 18, 26, 28
pátat 38, 45; n. 38
patayát 5, 33f., 41, 51–54, 101, 107,
 160; n. 41, 49, 51, 53, 112
parastarām/-tarām 64
parātarām 64
paré 108, 112, 114, 131, 133–135,
 137
paścā 87, 98–102, 113f., 118–120; n.
 100, 119

pākavát 11, 29, 31
purāṇavát 11, 29–31
pūrvavát 11, 29–31
piṭṭvát 11, 18f., 29–31
prācā 74, 86f., 92–98, 100–103, 107
pratarām/-tarām 64, 66, 71–73, 133;
n. 71, 72
pratnavát 11, 29–31
pravát 34–36, 41, 43f., 46f.; n. 24,
35, 41
priyamedhavát 10, 14; n. 29
bhārat 38, 40, 45; n. 38, 40
bharadvājavát 10; n. 29
bhṛguvát 10; n. 29
madhyā 56, 59, 62, 108, 110, 116f.,
121, 125f., 128f.; n. 108, 110
manuvát 10, 18, 28; n. 13, 28
manuṣvát 10, 12f., 28f.
mandhāṭṭvát 10, 18f.; n. 29
mīthuyā 57

mṛṣā 113, 141f., 153, 157–159; n.
158
yayātivát 10
raghuyā 57
vasiṣṭhavát 10; n. 29
vitarām/-tarām 64, 66
virūpavát 10, 14
viśvā(-) 89, 126f., 153; n. 89
vyaśvavát 10
súcā 141f., 153, 159
sanāt 1, 3, 108, 111, 114, 131, 136f.;
n. 106
saṃtarām 64; n. 63
samanā 59, 108, 110, 114, 122, 126,
130; n. 77
sādhuyā 57; n. 61
sīmā 39, 141–143, 160–162
sumnayā 56, 58
stāyát 5, 40; n. 40
sthūragūpavát 10
svapnayā 56f., 61; n. 110