PK
481
W61c

WHITNEY

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM
THE ATHARVA-VEDA

AA000356514 0
UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

California
gional
cility

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

Prof. Dr. Wempf. Göttingen
with high respects of
the Author.

CONTRIBUTIONS

FROM

THE ATHARVA-VEDA

TO THE THEORY OF

SANSKRIT VERBAL ACCENT.

BY

WILLIAM D. WHITNEY,

PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT IN YALE COLLEGE.

387-419

(From the Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. V, 1856.)

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/contributionsfro00whit

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE ATHARVA-VEDA

TO THE

THEORY OF SANSKRIT VERBAL ACCENT.

At a former meeting of the Society, I had the honor to lay before it, in connection with a review of a late work by Prof. Bopp, of Berlin, an attempt to state in a new and improved form the rules respecting the accentuation of the finite verb in the Sanskrit sentence.* That such an attempt was called for, will be evident enough to any one who will refer to the statement of these rules which is given in Benfey's larger Sanskrit grammar,† the latest and most elaborate work of its class, and the only one which professes to treat the subject in an exhaustive manner. It is not too much to say that the account of the phenomena of verbal accentuation which is there presented is entirely unsatisfactory, or even unintelligible; that it is plainly wanting in true method; that it is no orderly development from a central principle, subordinating the more particular to the more general, and giving each special rule its due proportion in the sum of the whole, but, on the contrary, a chaos of rules and exceptions, empirically stated and confusedly thrown together. That this is so, is not so much the fault of Prof. Benfey, as of the Indian grammarians, from whom, and not from the Sanskrit literature itself, he has drawn the materials out of which he has constructed his grammar: doubtless his statement is the best that could be derived from such sources; its imperfections only prove that the native gram-

† Vollständige Grammatik der Sanskritsprache, § 127, etc.
* See this Journal, vol. v, p. 213, etc.

161159

marians occupy with reference to this department of grammar the same position as to other departments also; that while they are laborious and ingenious assemblers and arrangers of particular facts, their shallow philosophy, and laboriously unnatural and arbitrary method, render them utterly unreliable guides for us to a true knowledge of the Sanskrit language, since their rules require to be explained, and limited, and re-arranged, by the light of the very facts which they attempt to classify and account for. I referred, at the close of my former remarks upon the subject, to this untrustworthiness of those who had been our chief authorities with reference to it, and expressed my opinion, that a rational and exhaustive theory of the principles producing the phenomena of verbal accentuation in Sanskrit, could only be arrived at by a careful study of the phenomena themselves, as laid before us in the various accented Vedic texts. I was then already engaged in assembling from the text of the Atharva-Veda all the material which could aid in elucidating the matter, all the passages in which the accent was not determined by, or in accordance with, the most general rules of accentuation, and which accordingly suggested more special rules, or appeared to be anomalous and exceptional cases; and as I have now completed the collection, I take this opportunity of presenting it to the Society, hoping that it will be found not without value as a contribution to the theory of Sanskrit accent. So far as was in my power, I have classified and explained the facts collected, presenting them in connection with the rules which they illustrate, and have thus been compelled to go over in part the same ground which I formerly traversed; if of a portion of them I am unable to give a satisfactory account, their statement here will at any rate tend to render possible their future explanation, by facilitating their examination by others, and their farther comparison with kindred facts, to be derived from the other accented texts.

The first and most general rule for the accentuation of the verb in the Sanskrit sentence is this. In a direct or independent sentence, or clause of a sentence, the finite verb is made enclitic upon any word preceding it which is directly connected with it in construction. It matters not what part of the sentence that word may be which stands before the verb; whether subject or predicate, whether direct or indi-

rect object, or other limiting circumstance, it takes away the accent from the verb itself. Take as instances the following clauses.

अम्बयो यन्त्यध्वभिः शिवा भव

ambáyo yanty ádhvabhiḥ (i. 4. 1); *çivâ' bhava* (iii. 28. 3);

तत्कृण्मो ब्रह्म तस्य भाजयतेह नः

tát kṛṇmo bráhma (iii. 30. 4); *tásya bhâjayate 'há naḥ* (i. 5. 2);

अभि क्रन्द प्र त्रासय आ वीरो ऽत्र जायताम्

abhí kranda prá trâsaya (v. 21. 4); *â' vîró 'tra jâyatâm* (iii. 23. 2).

Even if other unaccented words intervene between the accent and the verb, the effect upon the latter remains the same: thus

मधुना त्वा खनामसि नमस्ते रुद्र कृण्मः

mádhunâ tvâ khanâmasi (i. 34. 1); *námas te rudra kṛṇmaḥ* (xi. 2. 3).

It is well known that, by the operation of this rule, the Sanskrit verb is in a large majority of cases deprived of its accent. Thus verbal forms of the root कर्, *kar*, which are perhaps found in the Vedic texts with greater frequency and in greater variety than those of any other root, occur in the Atharvan four hundred and ninety-eight times; but only one hundred and forty-six times do they maintain their own proper accent; in the remaining three hundred and fifty-two instances they are accentless or enclitic.

If, however, the verb stands at the head of the sentence, it cannot, of course, be encliticized, but retains its accent; thus

दर्शय मा यातुधानान् वृश्चामि शत्रूणां बाहून्

darçáya mâ yâtudhâ'nân (iv. 20. 6); *vṛçcâ'mi çátrûṇâm bâhû'n* (vi. 65. 2).

This is in accordance with Greek usage, by which a word usually enclitic remains orthotone, if it stands first in the sentence. As the Sanskrit has no proclitics, its sentences always commence with an accented word.

As regards the working of this rule, it is to be remarked that in poetry each *pâda*, or ultimate subdivision of the verse, is treated as if it constituted an independent clause, and a verb standing at the head of it remains orthotone, even though preceded in another *pâda* by words directly dependent upon it. The following is an instance:

धातुर्देवस्य सत्येन कृणोमि पतिवेदनम्

dhâtúr devásya satyéna kṛṇómi pativédanam (ii. 36. 2).

Other cases are i. 8. 3, 4; 17. 1; 31. 1. ii. 9. 4, 5. iii. 10. 12. v. 22. 12. vi. 54. 2; 60. 3, etc., etc.

But farther, if the verb is preceded in the sentence or *pâda* only by a vocative, it retains its accent. The reason of this is sufficiently obvious. The vocative really forms no part of the sentence to which it is attached; it is neither subject nor predicate; it is a mere excrescence, a parenthesis; it is not, then, so connected in construction with the verb that the latter can be made dependent upon it with respect to accent. We have, accordingly,

सीते वन्दामहे त्वा विश्वे देवा वसवो रक्षतेमम्

sî'te vándâmahe tvâ (iii. 17. 8); *víçve devâ vásavo rákshate 'mám* (i. 30. 1). It is unnecessary to cite more of the numerous illustrations of this principle which are to be found in the text.

By the first rule, as stated, the verb is made dependent for accent only upon some word construed directly with it. If, then, a sentence be composed of several clauses, a verb standing at the head of any one of them will keep its own accent. Instances are

पातु ग्रावा पातु सोमो नो अंहसः

pâ'tu grâ'vâ pâ'tu sómo no áṅhasaḥ (vi. 3. 2);

अहा अरातिमविदः स्योनम्

áhâ árâtim ávidaḥ syonám (ii. 10. 7);

विश्वकर्मन्नमस्ते पाह्यस्मान्

víçvakarman námas te pâhy àsmâ'n (equal to *pâhí asmâ'n*) (ii. 35. 4).

And even if the object of the verb precede the latter, it does not take away its accent, provided it be also at the same time the object of another verb: thus

यातुधानस्य सोमप जहि प्रजां नयस्व च

yâtudhâ'nasya somapa jahí prajâ'ṁ náyasva ca (i. 8. 3).
Here the first verb is accented as standing at the head of the *pâda*, the second as commencing a new clause; the division of the sentence being made between the common object and the latter of the two verbs. A similar case, in which a common subject is regarded as belonging especially to the former of two verbs, and the latter one is accented, is

शृणोतु नः सुभगा बोधतु त्मना

çṛṇótu naḥ subhágâ bódhatu tmánâ (vii. 48. 1).

It is not very often that a division of the sentence into separate clauses thus takes place within the *pâda*, and that at the same time a verb happens to stand first after the division. And as the phenomenon is an interesting one, as indicating the necessity that the word to whose accent that of the verb is subordinated must be immediately connected in construction with the latter, and not a part of any other clause, I give here a complete list of all the instances of its occurrence found in the Atharvan. They are i. 8. 3; 17. 2. ii. 5. 4 (*bis*); 10. 7. iv. 5. 6; 11. 12; 21. 1. v. 2. 9. vi. 3. 1, 2; 4. 2; 9. 1; 44. 1; 77. 1; 99. 3; 136. 2. vii. 14. 4; 48. 1. viii. 1. 12; 2. 3; 4. 1, 13, 18. ix. 1. 8; 6. 61; 10. 6. x. 4. 12; 8. 26. xii. 3. 31. xiii. 1. 30; 4. 48, 55. xvi. 6. 1. xviii. 1. 23. xix. 45. 5; 49. 6; 58. 4. There is no case in the text in which a verb occupying this position is not accented, unless it be the following:

तप्तो घर्मो दुह्यते वामिषे मधु

taptó gharmó duhyate vâm ishé mádhu (vii. 73. 1).
If this is to be translated, as the analogy of the next verse seems to indicate, "the *gharma* is heated; honey is poured out to you for food," then the verb needs to be accented दुह्यते, *duhyáte*, and the reading should be so amended.

In some of these cases, the accentuation is an important indication of the way in which the structure of the sentence is to be understood.

From this list I have omitted, however, all those not infrequent cases which come under the operation of the familiar rule given by the Indian grammarians, that a verb is accented if immediately preceded by another verb. It is perfectly obvious that such a case is in reality only one coming under the general rule for the accenting of a verb at the head of its own clause in the sentence: there can be but one finite verb in a single clause; if, then, any verb immediately follows another verb, it necessarily occupies the initial position, and cannot be encliticized. Thus, in the sentence

x. 165, 1

तस्मा॑ अर्चाम कृ॒णवा॑म॒ निष्कृ॑तिम्

tásmâ arcâma kṛṇávâma níshkṛtim (vi. 27. 1),
the accent of the second verb is in no manner owing to the contiguity of the word which precedes it, but to the fact that it is followed by the only word directly connected with it in construction: it would equally require to be accented if the sentence were thus arranged;

अर्चा॑म॒ तस्मै॑ कृ॒णवा॑म॒ निष्कृ॑तिम्

árcâma tásmâi kṛṇávâma níshkṛtim,
and could be made enclitic only by having its own subject placed before it; as

तस्मा॑ अर्चाम॒ निष्कृ॑तिं कृणवाम

tásmâ arcâma níshkṛtim kṛṇavâma.
We might take one of the sentences previously given, and, by altering a little its arrangement, seem to bring its accentuation within the scope of the Indian rule; as

ग्रावा॑ पातु॒ पातु॒ सोमो॑ नो॒ अंह॑सः

grâ'vâ pâtu pâ'tu sómo no áṅhasaḥ;
whereas in fact the second पातु, *pâtu*, would still continue to retain its accent for the same reason as before, and for no other. Farther illustration is unnecessary: it is only to be wondered at that a rule so empirical as that of the Indian grammars should have maintained itself so long in currency, and that the true meaning of the phenomenon should not have been sooner remarked.

But there is another class of cases in the Atharvan, in which the verb retains its accent in virtue of its initial position, while nevertheless it is only by an arbitrary division of the sentence that it comes to be looked upon and treated as occupying that position. This will be best illustrated by an example:

आ नो गोषु भजता प्रजायाम्

â' no góshu bhájatâ' " prajâ'yâm (vi. 55. 2),
"Upon us kine bestow upon us progeny." This is capable of two modes of division; the comma may be placed either before or after the verb; we may read "Upon us kine bestow, upon us progeny," or "Upon us kine, bestow upon us progeny." The former is the more natural and easy; but the latter is not inadmissible, even in the English translation, and is notably easier in the Sanskrit original. In the first case the verb would be enclitic, in the second it would be orthotone; that in the text it actually does retain its accent shows that the sentence requires to be divided in the second manner. Another example is

जिह्वा ज्या भवति कुल्मलं वाक्

jihvâ' jyâ' bhávati kúlmalaṁ vâ'k (v. 18. 8),
"Lingua ejus in nervum convertitur in sagittam vox;" here, too, the verb is accented in virtue of the division "Lingua ejus in nervum, convertitur in sagittam vox." We have, then, the rule, that if the verb be both preceded and followed by either a subject or an object, to each of which it equally in idea belongs, it may be regarded as directly construed with the latter of the two, and may accordingly receive the accent.

Instances coming under the action of this rule are not very rare in the Atharvan. They are* iv. 5. 2; 9. 9. v. 18. 8; 27. 6. vi. 55. 2; 92. 3; 106. 1; 107. 1–4. vii. 4. 1. viii. 9. 13; 10. 12, 13, 22–29. ix. 5. 37. x. 8. 8. xii. 3. 25, 48. xiii. 1. 19; 2. 26; 3. 12. xiv. 1. 64. xv. 3. 4, 5, 10;

---

* In a few of these passages, viz. viii. 10. 12, 13, 22–29. xv. 4. 1–6, the accent has, owing to a misunderstanding, been omitted from the verbs in the published text, and requires to be restored, in accordance with the unanimous authority of the manuscripts.

4. 1–6. xviii. 3. 8. In a few of these passages, however, the accent of the verb admits also of being explained in another manner, as we shall see hereafter.

But on the other hand, it is quite as often the case in sentences of this character that the more obvious mode of division is followed, so that the verb remains unaccented. Instances are i. 12. 3. iii. 13. 6. viii. 10. 16. ix. 10. 26. xi. 9. 10. xv. 12. 5, 9. xvii. 17. xviii. 2. 7; 4. 11. xix. 10. 7; 36. 2; etc., etc.

Before proceeding to take notice of farther instances of verbal accentuation in the independent sentence, which are to be regarded as more special exceptions to the rules already stated, or as isolated and irregular cases, requiring particular explanation, we will consider the condition of the verb in a dependent clause.

The Sanskrit, like the German, distinguishes in a marked manner its accessory and dependent from its direct and independent clauses, by its different treatment of the verb in the two cases. But while the German removes the verb of the subordinate sentence from its natural position, and places it at the end of the sentence, thus changing, for instance, "Ich habe dem Manne das Buch gegeben" to "Da ich dem Manne das Buch gegeben habe," the Sanskrit, on the other hand, alters in a similar case not the position, but the accentuation, of the verb, changing it from enclitic to orthotone. We have, accordingly, the following general rule: the Sanskrit verb retains in a dependent clause its own proper accent; and that, too, even at the cost, in case the verb be one compounded with a preposition, of the accent of the prefixed preposition.

As in German the dependent clause is wont to be introduced by some word of such signification as necessarily conditions its dependency, a relative or a subordinating conjunction, so also in Sanskrit it generally contains some form, of declension or of derivation, from the relative pronominal stem य, *ya*. The phenomenon, indeed, has on this account been always hitherto thus stated: "the verb is accented in a sentence which contains a form of य, *ya*;" but it is impossible that we should remain contented with so empirical a rule as this; we must inquire in virtue of what principle it is that such words have a power to make the verb orthotone. And that the principle is indeed what it has above

been stated to be may be very satisfactorily shown. For other particles than those derived from the stem य, *ya*, if they have a like meaning, and possess the same power to render the sentence dependent, exercise the same influence upon the verb.

Thus चेत्, *cet* (which the *pada*-text divides into चा इत्, *ca it*), which means always distinctly "if," and is accordingly equivalent to यदि, *yadi*, preserves, as the latter would do, the accent of the verb with which it is connected. Instances of its occurrence are ii. 30. 2. v. 17. 3, 8, etc.

But च, *ca*, itself, without always losing its proper signification "and," or meaning distinctly "if," is not very infrequently made use of to assist in indicating the conditionality of a clause, whose verb is then left orthotone. An instance is

स चातिसृजेज्जुहुयान्न चातिसृजेन्न जुहुयात्

sá câ 'tisrjéj juhuyâ'n ná câ 'tisrjén ná juhuyât (xv. 12. 3), "And should he give permission, let him sacrifice; and should he not give permission, let him not sacrifice." Sometimes, indeed, the particle almost precisely equals यदि, *yadi*, as in the following passage:

हिंस्ते अदत्ता पुरुषं याचितां च न दित्सति

hínste ádattâ púrusham yâcitâ'm ca ná dítsati (xii. 4. 13), "Ungiven she harms a man, if he will not give her when demanded." The conditionality of the clause is the main efficient cause of the accenting of the verb; whether the particle has a full conditional meaning, or is employed merely as an expedient for facilitating the expression, is a matter of minor consequence. The other Atharvan passages of this character are viii. 10. 31. xi. 3. 28, 29, 32–49a, 55, 56. xii. 4. 1, 16, 19, 25.

Whether a clause in any case, without the presence of a word conditioning or indicating its dependent character, can be in such wise dependent as that its verb should be thereby rendered orthotone, is a question for the solution of which the Atharvan hardly presents sufficient material. There is but a single passage which seems to speak clearly with reference to this point:

उदकं याचत्युद्गायति

udakáṁ yâ'caty úd gâyati (ix. 6. 48),
"If he offers water" (the hymn is extolling the merit of hospitable attentions paid to guests), "he sings a *sâman*" (that is, "it is of equal virtue with the religious action of singing a *sâman*"). Here the conditionality of the first clause seems to be the sufficient cause of the accent of the verb; and on the other hand, a comparison of the preceding clauses, as

अभि वदति प्र स्तौति

abhí vadati prá stâuti,
"If he greets them, he utters praise," would seem to lead us to the recognition of this rule: that in such a situation the verb was left orthotone, except when compounded with a preposition, in which latter case the preposition still retained the accent.* But this single passage is not sufficient to establish a general rule: it is to be hoped that material may be derived from the other accented texts which shall clear up the matter. There is, so far as I have observed, but one other passage in the Atharvan, where it seems necessary to regard a clause as conditional which contains no indicatory particle; viz:

एतद्वो ज्योतिः पितरस्तृतीयं पञ्चौदनं ब्रह्मणेऽजं ददाति

etád vo jyótiḥ pitaras tṛtî'yam páñcâudanam brahmáṇe ʿjáṁ dadâti (ix. 5. 11),
"This is (i. e. wins) your third (i. e. highest) brightness, ye Fathers, that one gives to a Brahman a goat with five *odanas*." And here the verb is left unaccented, although not a compounded one. Whether the accentuation in either of these passages is erroneous, or how the seeming discrepancy between them is to be otherwise explained, I must leave an open question, until more light can be thrown upon the subject from other sources.

There is one other passage which might appear to require consideration in this connection:

---

* See Benfey's Grammar, § 127. 1 (remark), 5, 9 (remark 1), 11, for instances of this difference in accentual usage between the simple and compounded verb.

लक्ष्म कुर्व इति मन्यते

lákshma kurva íti mányate (xii. 4. 6),
"If he thinks to himself 'I am making a mark;'" yet the evidence to be derived from this is not wholly unambiguous, as it would not be altogether inadmissible to suppose the influence of the relative pronoun with which the verse begins to extend itself to this part also.

It is a well known fact that, by Vedic usage, the particle हि, *hi*, always accents the verb with which it is construed (as does also its negative, नहि, *nahi*). This also I ascribe to the conditional force inherent in it. It is, indeed, originally possessed of no such force; etymologically, it seems to be merely an asseverative particle, akin with ह, *ha*, and अह, *aha*. It is, accordingly, in the later language not infrequently employed as an expletive, to fill out the artificial structure of the *çloka;* and it is sometimes, even in the Veda, found so used, having a hardly appreciable significance in the sentence in which it occurs. But it is ordinarily made use of to accompany and point out a circumstance which is put forward as the ground of, the reason for, the inducement to, some other action; and by virtue of this usage, it has acquired a certain degree of causative or conditional force. The transition of meaning may be illustrated by an example or two. If we say "Help us, thou art surely mighty," (German "Hilf uns, du bist ja mächtig,") there is no distinct subordination of the latter clause to the former, and yet the second clause is evidently alleged as the reason of the first, and it is but a step farther to say "Help us, for thou art mighty." The Sanskrit sentence

प्र नो अव बलवान्ह्यसि

prá no ava bálavân hy ási,
would ordinarily, and with perfect correctness, be translated as equivalent to the latter form of the phrase; while it would nevertheless, strictly taken, rather correspond to the former. Indeed, as हि, *hi*, is never allowed to stand at the beginning of a sentence in Sanskrit, but must always follow some other word, and as it thus, although not enclitic, holds a subordinate position, it is still more clearly shown

to be unequal in force to our conjunction "for." In German, not even "for" gives to the clause which it introduces a dependent form: we say "Hilf uns, denn du bist mächtig:" yet the difference between this and the dependent clause "... weil du mächtig bist," "... because thou art mighty," is rather a formal than a logical one. There is a continuous scale of dependency in the phrases "thou art surely mighty," "for thou art mighty," "since thou art mighty," "because that thou art mighty," and while in German only the last is regarded as dependent, in Sanskrit the first is treated as if equivalent to any of the rest, and its verb is accented, according to the general rule for dependent clauses. We may reverse the order of the clauses in the example we have taken, and write

बलवान्ह्यसि प्र नो अव

bálavân hy ási prá no ava;

and here too we have the verb accented, as if the translation were "Since thou art mighty, help us," "Da du ja mächtig bist, so hilf uns;" while, if closely interpreted, it is rather, "Thou art surely mighty, (then) help us," "Du bist ja mächtig, (also) hilf uns;" the particle hardly exercising a stronger force than to establish the relation of the two clauses as *protasis* and *apodosis*.

In almost every instance of the occurrence of हि, *hi*, in the Atharvan, it has more or less evidently this semi-conditional force. Thus we have

उग्रा हि कण्वजम्भनी तामभक्षि सहस्वतीम्

ugrâ' hí kaṇvajámbhanî tâ'm abhakshi sáhasvatîm (ii. 25. 1), "Since it is a fierce destroyer of the *kaṇva*, it, the mighty, I have made use of." And again,

वि ते मुञ्चन्तां विमुचो हि सन्ति

ví té muñcantâṁ vimúco hí sánti* (vi. 112. 3),

"Let them release him, for they are releasers." It would

* The printed text gives, on the authority of all the manuscripts, *te;* but the emendation as above is evidently necessary. In many other cases also, the manuscripts confound *te* and *té*.

be easy to multiply examples, but it is believed that enough has already been said to establish and illustrate that which it was our purpose to show; that the particle in question derives its power to render the verb orthotone from the weak causative signification which the usage of the language has given it.

With regard to the particle नेत्, *net* (*pada*-text न।इत्।, *na it*), usage is divided. It occurs, in connection with a verb, but four times in the Atharvan. In two passages, viz. vi. 50. 1. xiii. 1. 12, it renders the verb orthotone, as if, like the kindred particle चेत्, *cet*, already treated of, it had acquired a subordinating force, and were equivalent to Latin *ne*, German *dass nicht!*; in the other two passages, viz. ii. 27. 1. xviii. 2. 58, it leaves the verb enclitic, as if the इत्, *it*, merely strengthened the force of the negative, as should be its most natural effect.

The three particles चेत्, *cet*, नेत्, *net*, and हि, *hi*, illustrate in an interesting manner each other's history. Neither of them has etymologically any relative or subordinating quality; they mean originally simply "and surely," "not surely," "surely;" but each has in the usage of the language developed out of this plain asseverative signification another which gives it the power to render the clause in which it is found dependent; and as "if," "lest," and "since," they make orthotone the verb with which they are construed.

The particle किम्, *kim*, nowhere in the Atharvan exercises an influence upon the accent of the verb in its clause, even where, as in vii. 56. 6, 8. viii. 4. 14(?). xviii. 1. 12, 33, it appears to ask a direct question. In v. 11. 5, *pâda* c, a part of the manuscripts do indeed accent the verb, yet the weight of authority is in favor of the text as printed. When the particle means "what?", "why?", or "how!", as in v. 13. 7. vi. 45. 1. ix. 10. 18, etc., etc., of course no effect upon the accent would be expected from it.

We have thus seen that the direct subordination of one clause of a sentence to another has an effect to render orthotone the verb of the subordinated clause. We have also remarked, when treating of the particle हि, *hi*, that the subordination does not always require to be absolute, but that a distinctly defined relation of two of the clauses of a sentence to one another as *protasis* and *apodosis* was sufficient to

preserve the accent of the verb in the former clause. We have now farther to notice, that this principle has in the usage of the language received a somewhat inorganic extension; that it has been stretched to cover cases to which it did not in strictness apply. Such I conceive, namely, to be the explanation of the accent of the verb in a very considerable number of passages, where two clauses stand as correlatives to one another, or even where there is such a parallelism between them that they may be regarded as in a manner correlative. The coördination is treated as if it were a subordination; the first of the coördinate clauses is looked upon as a *protasis*, to which the other constitutes an *apodosis*, and the verb of the former is allowed to remain orthotone.

Thus, for instance, when अन्य—अन्य, *anya–anya*, "the one—the other," stand opposed to one another, as subject or as object, in two like clauses, the verb of the first clause retains its accent. Take as examples

दक्षं ते अन्य आवातु व्यन्यो वातु यद्रपः

dákshaṁ te anyá âvâ'tu vy ànyó vâtu yád rápaḥ* (iv. 13. 2);

न्यन्यं चिक्युर्न नि चिक्युरन्यम्

ny ànyáṁ cikyúr ná ní cikyur anyám (ix. 10. 16).

The other instances are vii. 81. 1. ix. 9. 20; ~~10. 26~~. x. 7. 42. xiii. 2. 11. Also the passage vii. 35. 1a, b, may properly be regarded as coming under this rule, although only one अन्य, *anya*, that of the first clause, is there expressed; the other is contained in idea in the second clause.

In two cases, viz. x. 8. 36. xi. 8. 33, we have, instead of अन्य, *anya*, एक—एक, *eka—eka*, with the same meaning, and with a similar effect upon the accent of the verb.

In x. 8. 7, 13. xi. 4. 22, we find a like correlation produced by the use of अर्ध—अर्ध, *ardha—ardha*, "the one half—the other half."

But even where the correlation is less clearly and sharply brought out, if there is nevertheless a distinct antithesis, the same phenomenon of verbal accentuation is not infrequently presented. Thus we have in vi. 11. 3 an antithesis of "else-

* The reading of the printed text is false, and must be amended to agree with this.

where" and "here;" in xii. 2. 32, 55, of "those there" and "these here;" in iv. 5. 7, of "others" and "myself;" in vi. 67. 3, of motion "away" and "hither;" in ix. 10. 9, of "to-day" and "yesterday;" in ix. 10. 23, of an idea and its negation. Moreover, wherever वा–वा, *vâ—vâ*, "either—or," are construed in two clauses with two separate verbs, the correlation is regarded as distinct enough to occasion the accenting of the first verb; the instances are not numerous, but they are all those in which this particle so occurs; they are v. 1. 7 (where, however, the effect of the relative in the second clause might possibly be supposed to extend back into the first), viii. 4. 9. In the following passage,

तस्य॑ वा त्वं मन॑ इ॒हा स वा॒ तव॑

tásya vâ tvám mána ichâ' sá vâ táva (xviii. 1. 16),

the accent of the verb is unquestionably due to the same cause, although the sentence is incomplete, a part of the second clause, including its verb, being left to be supplied in idea from the first. More numerous are the cases in which the antithesis of च–च, *ca—ca*, "both—and," produces the same effect: they are ii. 6. 2; 13. 3. v. 4. 9; 23. 7 (where we have also, as in ix. 10. 23, the antithesis of an idea and its negation), vi. 110. 1. xiii. 1. 34 (*ter*). xvii. 6. xix. 24. 5, 6. In vii. 5. 5 is a like antithesis of उत–उत, *uta—uta*, unless we are rather to suppose the correlative force to lie in the two contrasted instrumentals. The following passage,

स्त्रियश्च सर्वाः स्वापय शुनश्चेन्द्रसखा चर॑न्

stríyaç ca sárvâḥ svâpáya çúnaç cé 'ndrasakhâ cáran (iv. 5. 2),

has been included above among the instances of initial accentuation, but is perhaps rather to be explained as an antithetical sentence of the class here treated of, of which the second member is defective, its verb requiring to be supplied from the first, as in the passage xviii. 1. 16, just now cited. Several other of the passages formerly referred to may also receive a similar explanation: thus iv. 9. 9 (where जम्भयत्, *jambhayat*, perhaps requires to be amended to जम्भय, *jambhaya*), v. 27. 6. vi. 107. 1–4. vii. 4. 1. ix. 5. 37. xii. 3. 25: while vi. 106. 1. viii. 9. 13. xiii. 3. 12. xiv. 1. 64, admit of being looked upon as defective antitheses of the other kinds here treated of.

Besides these, there are a few passages, composed each of two clauses, in the first of which the verb is left orthotone, where the antithesis is less distinctly marked than in the cases hitherto noted, while nevertheless their accentuation seems to be referable to the same principle. They are vi. 32. 2; 83. 1. ix. 5. 22; 8. 10. xii. 3. 18. xiii. 2. 30 b. xiv. 1. 13. Had we these passages only, we should not venture to derive from them any such principle; but, having well established it as a tendency of the language to assume, even on slight occasion, an antithetical relation, and to accent accordingly, we are justified in presuming its extension to these cases also.

We have thus far found all the phenomena of verbal accentuation of which we have taken note to be occasioned, more or less regularly and directly, by the working of a single principle; that, namely, the verb in an independent clause is accented only when occupying the initial position, being otherwise made enclitic upon any member of the same clause by which it is preceded; while, on the other hand, it maintains in a dependent clause its own proper accent. But there are in the Atharvan a number of instances of accented verbs, which do not seem to fall so clearly within the sphere of action of this principle: either they are the effect of a wholly irregular extension of it beyond its proper limits, or they are due to the operation of some other principle, which needs to be evolved and stated, or they are isolated cases, destitute of all analogies, and on that account of doubtful authenticity. Before we proceed to the consideration of these remaining cases, we must take notice of the condition in which the accentuation of the Atharvan is presented by the manuscripts of the text now extant. The whole text is very much less accurately and correctly constructed than is that of the Rik: there are to be found in it gross blunders, of which the correction is almost at the first sight apparent, and many passages are in a very corrupt state, requiring extensive emendation. But it especially abounds in palpable errors of accentuation: many of these we have even not hesitated to amend in the published edition: thus, words of frequent occurrence have been in an instance or two accented upon the wrong syllable; nominatives have been erroneously taken for vocatives, and deprived of their accent, or vocatives have been falsely regarded as nominatives, and

have received an accent to which they were not entitled; the true point of division between the two *pâdas* of a line has been mistaken, and vocatives and verbal forms have been in consequence wrongly accented, or left unaccented, as they were wrongly supposed to stand, or not to stand, at the beginning of the second *pâda;* the verb of a clearly dependent clause, even after a form of the relative य, *ya*, has been left enclitic; and so on. More than a hundred such cases have been corrected by us in the published text, and not a few which we have left untouched still call for emendation: our commentary will, of course, fully explain and account for the alterations we have made in the text offered by the manuscripts, and will point out the places where we suppose that farther alteration is demanded. It may then, of course, not very infrequently be the case, that verbal forms are erroneously accented by the manuscripts; it would be strange if it were not so, at least in some instances; yet in so much uncertainty has the subject of verbal accentuation hitherto been involved, that we have only very rarely, and in cases which seemed quite clear, ventured to take away from a verb an accent which our authorities gave to it. Sometimes, indeed, we have allowed ourselves even that liberty: I will proceed to give the instances here, in order to avoid the possibility of having omitted from this paper material which ought to be embraced in it.

Thus, in iv. 32. 1, we have read

सह ओजः पुष्यति विश्वमानुषक्

sáha ójaḥ pushyati víçvam ânushák,

while all the manuscripts give ओजः पुष्यति, *ójaḥ púshyati*, because the former reading seems better to suit the sense, and because the Rig-Veda, in the corresponding passage (x. 83. 1), leaves the verb unaccented. It might, nevertheless, not be impossible to account for the reading as given by the Atharvan manuscripts: if we regard the two words preceding the verb as objects of the verb of the preceding *pâda*, or, better, if we look upon the word following the verb as a noun constituting an independent object of it, translating "might, strength—he acquires everything in succession," then the verb would be entitled to be accented in virtue of its initial position.

Again, in iv. 31. 2, stands in the text

अग्निरिव मन्यो त्विषितः सहस्व सेनानीर्नः सहुरे

agnír iva manyo tvishitáḥ sahasva senânî'r naḥ sahure

हूत एधि

hûtá edhi,

whereas all the *sanhitâ* manuscripts (excepting one, which is amended to the above reading) give सहस्व, *sáhasva.* The Rik (x. 84. 2) leaves the verb unaccented, which, with the *pada* manuscript, and the amended *sanhitâ*, seemed to us sufficient authority for the reading which we have adopted. Yet even here I do not regard the accenting of the verb as certainly erroneous: it might be defended by the analogy of vi. 32. 2, and of the other passages cited with the latter above, as an indistinct antithesis.

Another case, iv. 31. 7, is clearer; we read

पराजितासो अप नि लयन्ताम्

párâjitâso ápa ní layantâm,

spite of the authority of the manuscripts, which are unanimous in favor of लयन्ताम्, *láyantâm.* Here also the Rik (x. 84. 7) has the former reading, nor does there seem to be any conceivable reason why the verb should be accented, nor, if it were so, could the preceding preposition maintain its accent also, as the manuscripts allow it to do. We have evidently a mere blunder of the manuscripts to deal with in this passage.

In iii. 2. 1, all the manuscripts read

अग्निर्नो दूतः प्रत्येतु विद्वान्

agnír no dûtáḥ pratyétu vidvâ'n,

which we have altered to प्रत्येतु, *práty etu.* The analogy of the first line of the preceding hymn was sufficient authority for the alteration, and it is not easy to see how the manuscripts should have come to commit the error of accenting the verb here; unless, possibly, they were led away by the fancied analogy of the last *pâda* of the second verse in the

preceding hymn, where it is in fact the presence of a हि, *hi*, that makes the verb orthotone.*

In v. 12. 2, the manuscripts have

तनूनपात्पथ ऋतस्य यानान्मध्वा समञ्जन्त्स्वदया सुजिह्व

tánûnapât pathá ṛtásya yâ'nân mádhvâ samañjánt svadáyâ sujihva,

while the printed text gives स्वदया, *svadayâ*. The latter reading was adopted on the authority of the corresponding passage in the Rik (x. 110. 2), as there seemed to be no reason requiring the verb to be accented. Yet here also, it might be possible to defend the reading of the manuscripts: if the accusative in the first *pâda* be regarded as the object more directly of the participle than of the verb, as would be allowable, the latter might be looked upon as occupying an initial position, and therefore entitled to retain its accent.

Again, in vi. 131. 2, the edition has

आकूते समिदं नमः

â'kûte sám idáṁ namaḥ,

while all the manuscripts agree in reading नमः, *námaḥ*. The propriety of the emendation cannot be questioned: the false reading may have been a mere slip of the pen on the part of the scribe of the original manuscript, or the word may have been mistaken for the frequent noun नमः, *námaḥ*.

Another very similar instance is found in xviii. 2. 36,

शं तप माति तपो अग्ने मा तन्वं१ तपः

çáṁ tapa mâ' 'ti tapo ágne mâ' tanvàṁ tápaḥ:

here, too, there seems to be no assignable reason why the last word should be accented: I suspect it to have been taken, by a blunder, for the common noun तपः *tápaḥ*, "penance," and would alter the reading to तन्वं तपः, *tanvàṁ tapaḥ*.

Once more, in xiv. 1. 16,

तद्द्धातय इद्विदुः

tád addhâtáya íd viduḥ,

---

* But where, by an error of the press, *práty etu* stands, instead of *pratyétu*, which the manuscripts correctly give.

all the Atharvan manuscripts give इद्विदुः, *íd vidúḥ:* as the accent of the verb seemed in this passage quite unexplainable, we have not hesitated to amend it to an agrement with the parallel passage of the Rik (x. 85. 16).

These are all the instances in which we have taken away from any verbal form an accent given to it by the manuscripts; excepting two, which bear plainly on their face the evidence that they are blunders, being accented upon the wrong syllable. These are i. 24. 1, रूपं चक्रे *rûpáṁ cakre*, for which all the manuscripts have चक्रे, *cákre*, while the true accentuation of the form, if accented at all, would be चक्रे, *cakré;* and xii. 4. 28, देवा वृश्चन्ति, *devâ' vṛçcanti*, in place of which the manuscripts unanimously read वृश्चन्ति, *vṛ'çcanti*, although only the accentuation वृश्चन्ति, *vṛçcánti*, could be tolerated. It is sufficiently clear that, in both these cases, the errors are due to a slip of the pen of the scribe who copied the original manuscript from which all ours are descended, the mark of the accent being set over the wrong syllable.

In the light of these facts, which indicate clearly what allowance is to be made for inaccuracies and errors in the text, we may now proceed to examine the remaining instances of accented verbs which it presents.

In iii. 23. 5, we have

यस्तुभ्यं शमसच्छमु तस्मै त्वं भव

yás túbhyaṁ çám ásac chám u tásmâi tvám bháva.

The most natural ending to the verse would seem to be

शमु यस्मै त्वं भवः

çám u yásmâi tvám bhávaḥ,

"and to whom thou in turn mayest be propitious;" and it is perhaps not impossible that this is felt to be virtually present in the reading as given, and that therefore the imperative is accented; yet there is room to suspect भव, *bháva*, to be a mere slip of the pen for भव, *bhava.*

Again, in iv. 1. 4c,

महान्मही अस्कभायद्वि जातः

mahâ'n mahî' áskabhâyad ví jâtáḥ,

it is very hard to see why the verb should have in this *pâda* an accent which it lacks in the preceding one, where the construction seems to be the same. Probably we have to amend to अस्क°, *askabhâyad.*

In verse 7 of the same hymn, in the last *pâda*,

कविर्देवो न दभायत्स्वधावान्

kavír devó ná dábhâyat svadhâ'vân,

we seem, indeed, to have an accented verbal form; but it is only in seeming; for दभायत्, *dábhâyat*, is unquestionably to be amended to दभाय, *dábhâya*, dative of दभ, *dabha;* and the passage means, he "is not for a harming," i. e. "is not one who can be harmed." This construction, frequent enough in the Rik, is quite rare in the Atharvan, and in one or two other instances has been badly blundered over by the establishers of the text. If we had here, it may be remarked, a verbal form requiring accent, it would have to be accented दभायत्, *dabhâyát.*

Again, in iv. 19. 2,

न तत्र भयमस्ति यत्र प्राप्नोष्योषधे

ná tátra bhayám ásti yátra prâpnóshy oshadhe,

I am inclined to attribute the hardly otherwise explainable accent of the first verb to an original error of transcription, and to amend to भयमस्ति, *bhayám asti.*

Again, in v. 18. 4,

निर्वै क्षत्रं नयति हन्ति वर्चः

nír vâ'i kshatrám náyati hánti várcaḥ,

we might suspect नयति, *náyati*, to be an error for नयति, *nayati;* yet it seems better here to assume an antithesis between the two clauses, of force enough to render orthotone the verb of the first.

Again, in vi. 21. 3, we have

उत स्थ केशदृंहणीरथो ह केशवर्धनीः

utá sthá keçadṛ'ṅhaṇîr átho ha keçavárdhanîḥ.

Here, too, it may be made a question whether we are to find a sufficient antithesis to account for the accent of the verb, or whether we are to suppose that the accent-sign has been slipped away from the स्थ, *stha*, to the succeeding syllable. I incline to prefer the former.

Again, in vi. 32. 1, the printed text gives

अन्तर्द्वावे जुहुता स्वेतत्

antardâvé juhutâ sv ètát,

but it is by an error of the press, for जुहुता, *juhutâ'*, which is the reading of the manuscripts. But I conceive this to be a reversal of the original error by which the verb got its accent in the manuscripts, as I am unable to find any reason why it should be left orthotone.

In the passage vi. 60. 2,

अङ्गो न्वर्यमन्नस्या अन्याः समनमायति

angó nv àryamann asyâ' anyâ'ḥ sámanam â'yati,

the *pada*-text divides the last word आऽअयति, *â-áyati*, thus giving the verb an accent. But I do not see how the form, which is elsewhere always singular, can be borne as a plural; it may, perhaps, be amended to आयन्ति, that is, आ।अयन्ति, *â' ayanti.*

A similar case is vi. 131. 3,

ततस्त्वं पुनरायसि

tátas tvám̀ púnar â'yasi,

which the *pada*-text understands to be आऽअयसि, *â-áyasi*, whereas it is rather आ।अयसि, *â' ayasi.*

Again, in vi. 78. 2,

रय्या सहस्रवर्चसमौ स्तामनुपक्षितौ

rayyâ' sahásravarcase 'mâ'u stâ'm ánupakshitâu,

I can discover no ground for preserving to the verb its accent, and believe the accent-sign to have become lost from under it. I would read स्ताम°, *stâm*, etc.

Again, in vi. 128. 1,

इदं राष्ट्रमसादिति

idám râshṭrám ásâd íti,

we are perhaps to assume that an accent-sign has been omitted under the syllable म, *ma*, the restoration of which would leave the verb unaccented.

Again, in viii. 10. 1,

इयमेवेदं भविष्यतीति

iyám evé 'dám bhavishyátî' 'ti,

it may be that the last horizontal accent-sign has been slipped away from its place, and that we have to amend to भविष्यतीति, *bhavishyatî' 'ti*.

Had we these two instances only, of clauses cited by means of the particle of quotation इति, *iti*, we should be inclined to regard them as cases of the accenting of the verb in a dependent clause; since a quoted sentence is in fact a kind of dependent sentence, and is so treated in some languages, being distinguished in German, for instance, by the use of the subjunctive instead of the indicative mood. And perhaps we may be allowed to explain thus the accent of the two clauses under consideration, even though no other analogous passages can be adduced to support this explanation. For, of all the numerous cases in the text (more than thirty), where a clause containing a verb is cited by the particle इति, *iti*, these two are the only ones in which the verb receives an accent. Elsewhere, the quotation is made in the form of an independent sentence, just as it would be spoken; and that, whether it be the direct object of a verb of speaking, as in i. 7. 4, or whether it indicate the "reason why," or the "end for which" (which was its use in the two passages last quoted), as in x. 2. 5. Other instances are iv. 17. 4; 20. 6. v. 19. 9; 23. 1, etc., etc.

Again, in xiv. 1. 32,

विश्वे देवाः क्रन्निह वो मनांसि

víçve devâ'h kránn ihá vo mánâṅsi,

I can discover no reason why the verb should be accented,

and suspect the true reading to be क्रन्निह, *krann ihá*, a sign of accent having been lost in the manuscripts.

Again, in xix. 31. 6,

अहं पशूनामधिपा असानि मयि पुष्टं पुष्टपतिर्दधातु

ahám paçûnâ'm adhipâ' ásâni máyi pushṭám pushṭapátir dadhâtu, it seems very uncertain whether the antithesis can be regarded as being distinct enough to warrant the accenting of the verb in the first *pâda*. And it is moreover to be noticed, that in the nineteenth book of the text the manuscripts are most especially faulty, so that their authority in doubtful and difficult cases is of almost no weight whatever. I have not pretended to give above all the instances in which we have amended in this book the accentuation of verbs: a record of them may be found among the foot-notes to each page. We need not, then, hesitate to amend to असानि, *asâni*, if it shall seem desirable, in the passage now under consideration.

In the passages thus far treated, we have been inclined to suspect an error in the tradition of the text, where the verbal accent has not appeared to be explainable by ordinary rules and analogies. But there are others in which we seem to discover irregular and anomalous applications of some of the rules previously stated; which we can hardly regard as errors of transcription, but which may possibly be, at least in part, errors of apprehension on the part of those who established the text. Whether they are to be understood in this way, or whether they are true and faithfully recorded phenomena of the Vedic language, only of a sporadic character, and not reducible to strict rule, may be better determined when we have before us cases of a like character from the other accented texts also.

We have, in i. 20. 1,

अस्मिन्यज्ञे मरुतो मृडता नः

asmín yajñé maruto mṛḍátâ naḥ.

Here the verb is accented as immediately following a vocative, although the latter does not stand at the head of a *pâda*, and has not itself an accent, as ought to be the case, if the verb is to remain orthotone.

A similar case is found in i. 32. 1;

इदं जनासो विदथ महद्ब्रह्म वदिष्यति

idám janâso vidátha mahád bráhma vadishyati.
The reading विदथ, *vidátha*, may be looked upon as somewhat suspicious here, since the sense requires rather an imperative form than an indicative, and since the Atharvan offers no other instance of a form in the present tense of either mood from this root, as conjugated after the manner of the sixth conjugation-class. But neither consideration is conclusive against the genuineness of the reading, for analogous forms occur in the Rik, and the substitution in the Veda of indicative for imperative is by no means unknown. And the passage is so closely analogous to xx. 127. 1,

इदं जना उप श्रुत नाराशंस स्तविष्यते

idám janâ úpa çruta nârâçaṅsá stavishyate,
that it seems better to retain the word in question unchanged, and not to amend it to विदथं, *vidátham,* as it would be very easy to do, making a fair sense. The accenting of the form would be, as in the preceding case, an irregular extension of the rule for accenting after a vocative. We might possibly understand इदं, *idam*, as a mere exclamation, translating "See here, ye people! hear!" which would account for the accent; but the analogy of ii. 12. 2, इदं देवाः शृणुत, *idám devâḥ çṛṇuta*, is against it, nor do I know any other instance of such a use of इदम, *idam.*

Again, in i. 30. 1,

विश्वे देवा वसवो रक्षतेममुतादित्या जागृत यूयमस्मिन्

viçve devâ vásavo rákshate 'mám utâ' "dityâ jâgṛtá yûyám asmín,
the accenting of the verb in the second clause may be looked upon as of kindred character with that in the two passages last treated of. Yet the sentence may be also so divided as to make the verb virtually the first word in its clause; if, namely, we translate "All ye gods, ye Vasus, guard this person; and ye Adityas likewise, watch ye over him."

Again, in xiv. 2. 42, we have

युवं ब्रह्मणो ऽनुमन्यमानौ बृहस्पते साकमिन्द्रश्च दत्तम्

yuvám brahmáṇe ऽ numányamânâu br'haspate sâkám índraç ca dattám.

Here the structure of the sentence appears to be understood as if the words between the vocative and the verb in the second *pâda* were a kind of parenthesis merely, so that the latter is accented as if it immediately followed the former. "Do ye two . . . . O Bṛhaspati, Indra also along with you, grant."

Again, in xi. 2. 2,

शुने क्रोष्ट्रे मा शरीराणि कर्तमलिक्लवेभ्यः

çúne kroshṭré mâ' çárîrâṇi kártam alíklavebhyaḥ, etc.,

we have the verb accented, as it seems to me, by an irregular application of the rule allowing the verb to be treated as if directly construed with the following, instead of with the preceding object. The first two words of this passage do indeed stand in the same relation to the verb as the last one, and, so far as they alone were concerned, the verb would be entitled to remain accented: but the introduction of the other two limiting words alters the case, and should render it enclitic again: this, however, appears to have been overlooked, or else deliberately neglected. I do not see any other way of accounting for the accent of the verb here.

Again, in xviii. 4. 54, we have

ऊर्जो भागो य इमं जजानाप्मान्नानामाधिपत्यं जगाम

ûrjó bhâgó yá imâṁ jajâ'nâ' 'çmâ' 'nnânâm â'dhipatyaṁ jagâ'ma.

The meaning and connection of this passage are very obscure; I do not understand them sufficently to be able to say whether the last verb is correctly accented, as being of the same construction with the first, or whether it should rather be made enclitic, as belonging to an independent clause, or whether its accentuation is to be accounted for in some other manner.

Again, in i. 17. 2c, d, is read

कनिष्ठिका च तिष्ठति तिष्ठादिद्धमनिर्महो

kanishṭhikâ' ca tíshṭhati tíshṭhâd íd dhamánir mahî'.

This seems to be an incomplete construction of the kind noted above, where an antithesis sufficient to accent the verb of the former clause is produced by the particles च–च, *ca–ca*, "both—and." In this case the second clause contains, instead of च, *ca*, इत्, *it*, but the effect may be looked upon as being virtually the same.

A similar case, perhaps, in found in v. 12. 1,

आ च वहं मित्रमहश्चिकित्वान्त्वं दूतः कविरसि प्रचेताः

â' ca váha mitramahaç cikitvâ'n tvám dûtáḥ kavír asi prácetáḥ.
Here the accent of the first verb is at any rate assured to it by the fact that the corresponding Rik passage (x. 110. 1) has the same reading. We might possibly conjecture, as the cause of it, such an incomplete antithesis as was supposed in the last case, the completion of the construction being broken off by an *anacolouthon*. Or we may assign to the particle च, *ca*, such an office as हि, *hi*, would fill, if used in place of it (compare vi. 27. 2. viii. 1. 6.); "bring hither, etc.; [in that case, or if thou so dost] thou art our messenger, etc."

Again, in vii. 35. 1c, d,

इदं राष्ट्रं पिपृहि सौभगाय विश्व एनमनु मदन्तु देवाः

idám râshṭrám pipṛhí sâ'ubhagâya víçva enam ánu madantu devâ'ḥ,
the accenting of the verb in the first *pâda* seems to be the effect of the assumption of an antithesis between the two clauses, which is facilitated, perhaps, by the more distinct antithetical construction of the preceding line of the couplet.

In viii. 7. 21, we find

उज्जिहीधे स्तनयत्यभिक्रन्दत्योषधीः

új jihîdhve stanáyaty abhikrándaty oshadhîḥ,
while अभि क्रन्दति, *abhí krandati*, would seem to be the easier and more natural reading. We cannot well assume here an error of transcription, nor can we plausibly regard the two verbal forms as locatives of the present participle. I do not understand the reason of the accent as it stands.

In xi. 9. 9, 11, 25, we have, three times repeated, the words

अमित्रेषु समीक्षयन्

amítreshu samîksháyan,

which can hardly be translated otherwise than "may they show themselves among our enemies;" so that the accent should be, according to general analogies, समीक्षयन्, *sám îkshayan.* But there is something especial and unusual about this phrase, inserted each time, as it is, where it seems not particularly in place; and it may have some relation or significance which I have not discovered. At present I am compelled to pass by the accent as problematical.

There are three passages in which the word बभूव, *babhûva,* is accented, at the end of the line, in a manner which is not accounted for by any general rule. They are as follows:

.... स्वसा ऋषीणां भूतकृतां बभूव

svása ṛ'shîṇâm bhûtakṛ'tâm babhû'va (vi. 133. 4);

.... मधुमन्मध्यं वीरुधां बभूव

mádhuman múdhyaṁ vîrúdhâm babhû'va (viii. 7. 12);

.... अदब्धचक्षुः परि विश्वं बभूव

ádabdhacakshuḥ pári víçvam babhû'va (xiii. 2. 44).

In neither of these cases is the clause a dependent one, or a member of an antithesis, nor am I able to discover any special ground for the accent of the verbs. It is to be noted, however, that the verbal form here in question stands in the Atharvan very often, indeed, in almost every case in which it occurs at all, at the end of a *pâda;* and that in numerous instances (seventeen in all) it receives an accent in that position; not without a distinct reason, it is true, in each case, such as is wanting in the three passages now under consideration; yet it may be that the frequent occurrence of that ending led to the transference of its accentuation to these three passages: the tonic cadence was familiar to the ear, and was accordingly intruded upon a few lines to which it did not properly belong. This explanation, however, I do not regard as very satisfactory, especially as there are also in the text nineteen cases of the same word standing unac-

cented at the end of a *pâda;* I only offer it as the most plausible one which I am able to suggest.

It will be noticed that no other general principle of verbal accentuation than that first enunciated has been regarded as established, or even suggested, by the passages which we have cited. Some, indeed,* have been inclined to assume that the verb was occasionally suffered to retain its accent when it was sought to give especial force to the expression, or else when a peculiar emphasis, or distinctive stress of voice, was by the sense required to be laid upon the verb itself. But although it seems highly plausible that such causes should sometimes produce such an effect, there is almost no distinct evidence to be derived from the text of the Atharvan that they do produce it. It might not be quite impossible to force such a explanation upon some of the cases which we have looked upon above as problematical, while yet it would be hard to find in them any reason for accenting the verb which would not equally apply to a great many passages in the text which are actually left to be accented according to the general rules. And it is reasonable to require that such a principle be established upon the evidence of a sufficient number of unambiguous passages, before we make use of it to explain doubtful and difficult cases.

But there are a few passages in the Atharvan, for whose explanation we are tempted to suppose the existence and efficiency in the language of this principle of energetic or emphatic accentuation. Thus we have, in the first place, four verses, in which the asseverative particles अह, *aha*, इत्, *it*, and किल, *kila*, appear to accent the verbs in connection with which they are taken. They are the following:

ममेद॑ह क्रतावसो मम चित्तमुपायसि

mámé 'd áha krátâv áso máma cittám upâ'yasi (i. e. *upa-â'-ayasi*) (i. 34. 2);

अहं वदामि नेत्त्वं सभायामह त्वं वद

ahám vadâmi nét tvám sabhâ'yâm áha tvám váda (vii. 38. 4);

---

* So Benfey, Vollst. Sanskr. Gr., § 129.

ममेदसस्त्वं केवलो नान्यासां कीर्तयाश्चन

mâmé 'd ásas tvám kévalo nâ' 'nyâ'sâm kîrtáyâç caná (vii. 38. 4);

मामित्किल त्वं वनाः शाखां मधुमतीमिव

mâ'm ít kíla tvám vánâḥ çâ'khâm mádhumatîm iva (i. 34. 4). With regard to अह, *aha*, it is to be remarked, that it nowhere else in the Atharvan occurs in such connection as to show whether it possesses a general power to accent the verb. But, of six passages in which it is found in the first Ashṭaka of the Rik, there is but one in which it exercises such a power. As for the first line given, there is room for suspecting an antithesis (certainly not less than in xix. 31. 6, cited above); or the partial analogies of iii. 25. 5. vi. 42. 3 may have had some influence upon its accentuation. In the second instance, a very slight change of place of the last accent-sign would rob the verb of its accent.* The particle इत्, *it*, is of very frequent occurrence in the text, but nowhere else influences the accent of a verb, unless when in composition with च, *ca*, and न, *na*, as before explained. And for the third passage also, the analogy of the parallel passage vii. 37. 1 may not have been without effect. The particle किल, *kila*, occurs in two other places in the Atharvan, viz. in iv. 7. 3. xviii. 1. 15, as also in Rik i. 32. 4, without rendering the verb orthotone: I am not able at present to refer to any other passages illustrating its use.

In these four instances, the accent of the verbs certainly is not of the nature of what we call emphasis; there exists no reason why a distinguishing stress of voice should be laid upon them; in each case, some other word than the verb is the emphatic one. If the verbs are indeed accented in them in virtue of the influence of the asseverative particles, it must be as the utterance of the whole clause takes place with so much additional force, that the verb also shares in it, to the extent of having its lost accent restored to it. And yet it would seem as if this effect of increased energy of enunciation would better express itself by laying a stronger stress upon the already accented syllables, than

* And this change has actually been made in the published text.

by giving it to others which were not properly entitled to it.

There are, however, two or three passages, in which signs of a real emphasis are perhaps discoverable. Thus, in ii. 7. 4,

अरातिर्नो मा तारीन्मा नस्तारिषुरभिमातयः

árâtir no mâ' târîn mâ' nas târishúr abhímâtayaḥ,

the second verb may be accented because the difference of its form from that of the first struck the sense, and seemed to call for a special notice. Yet this is quite doubtful, since we have seen hitherto that, in the case of two correlative and contrasted sentences, the tendency of the language was to accent the verb of the first, and not of the second.

We have, again, in iv. 18. 6, and repeated in v. 31. 11,

यश्चकार न शशाक कर्तुम्

yáç cakâ'ra ná çaçâ'ka kártum,

"He who hath done, hath not been able to do;" i. e., "He who hath attempted, hath not been able to accomplish." Here we may plausibly suppose the accent laid upon the second verb to be an emphatic one.

Once more, in xii. 3. 26, we read

शुद्धाः सतीस्ता उ शुम्भन्त एव

çuddhâ'ḥ satî's tâ' u çúmbhanta evá.

In this passage, as in the last but one, the verb is perhaps marked with its independent accent in order to indicate more strongly its distinction from the preceding participle.

Whether the evidence of these few passages, themselves in part doubtful, and capable of a different explanation, will be considered of so much weight that we may found upon it the assertion, that the Sanskrit tends to accent the verb in a sentence which is meant to be expressed with peculiar energy, or where the sense lays a peculiar force upon it, is very questionable. The existence of such a tendency must remain doubtful until new support shall be found for it from the other accented texts. It is not unlikely that these will furnish parallel passages which shall explain many of those which have occasioned us difficulty, by showing them to be referable to new principles, or to new modes of action

of the principles already laid down, which, by the aid of the material furnished by the Atharvan alone, we have not discovered.

We have thus passed in review all the cases occurring in the first nineteen books of the Atharvan, in which the accent of the verb was determined by other than the most general rules, and which accordingly either threw light upon the theory of verbal accentuation, or required especial treatment, as being of an exceptional and anomalous character. I have not included with them the instances derivable from the twentieth and concluding book, because the more proper occasion for presenting these would seem to be a discussion of the accentual rules as illustrated by the Rig-Veda; since the book in question forms really no part of the Atharvan, and is only a collection of extracts from the Rik.* For the sake of completeness, however, I append here a brief statement of the passages in it which are of like character with those already given for the other books.

Instances of a verb accented because standing at the head of its own clause, the division of the sentence taking place within the limits of a *pâda*, are xx. 3. 1; 8. 1a, b; 11. 10; 16. 11d; 27, 2; 35. 2; 46. 3; 54. 1; 65. 1; 67. 5; 91. 12; 92. 8, 16; 95. 3; 117. 1; 137. 8.

In xx. 16. 11c, we have a case of accentuation of the verb regarded as directly construed with the following, instead of with the preceding object.

In xx. 20. 6, the particle च, *ca*, indicates the conditionality of the clause, whose verb accordingly remains orthotone. In 113. 1, we either have another similar case, or the word उभयं, *ubhayam*, with which the verse begins, is a general introduction to it, and not specially connected with the following verb, which is then left accented in virtue of its initial position: as, "Both these two things—let Indra hear our voice . . . . and let him come hither," etc.

The particle कुवित्, *kuvit*, accents the verb in xx. 24. 2, 4, the only instances of its occurrence.

---

* From this statement should be excepted, of course, the few peculiar passages found in connection with those extracts: yet they also were not to be made use of in an investigation like the present; their accentuation in the manuscripts is too corrupt to be of any authority; the editors have had to accent them anew in accordance with rules and analogies elsewhere established.

In xx. 70. 6 is a case of an antithesis with वा–वा, *vâ–vâ*, which, as in xviii. 1. 16, cited above (p. 15), is incomplete, the second verb being left to be supplied.

The passage xx. 55. 1 appears to be another instance of an incompletely stated antithesis, only the former of the two particles च, *ca*, being expressed. It may be compared with i. 17. 2c, d, and v. 12. 1 (cited on pages 26 and 27).

A distinct antithesis is exhibited in xx. 56. 3 d; "Whom, on the one hand, wilt thou slay? whom, on the other, set in the midst of wealth?" and the usual effect of such a construction is seen in the accenting of the former verb.

In xx. 16. 11d, the former of the two verbs is accented by the action of the same principle. In xx. 8. 1 c; 89. 5 we have two cases closely akin with v. 18. 4 (see above, p. 21), the correctness of the accentuation in which passage may be looked upon as clearly established by their analogy.

In xx. 67. 7d, we have a case of the irregular accenting of a verb after a vocative, in a like situation as in i. 20. 1 (cited above, p. 24).

In the passage xx. 5. 5,

एहीमस्य द्रवा पिब

é 'hî "m asyá drávâ píba.

"Come hither now, of this [Soma], run, drink," the introduction of द्रव, *drava*, in parenthesis, between पिब, *piba*, and its object, has so broken the continuity of the sentence that the latter verb can no longer be made enclitic, but is suffered to retain an independent accent.

It thus appears that in that portion of the Rik text (about a thirteenth part of the whole) of which the concluding book of the Atharvan is composed, there are no phenomena of verbal accentuation inconsistent with the rules which have been given above, nor any that require other principles for their explanation. Whether, in the whole body of the Rik, phenomena of a different character may be found, must remain to be decided by examination. Considering the greater amount of material which the older Veda presents, as well as the superior accuracy of its text as fixed by tradition, its speedy examination with a view to this subject is greatly to be desired, in order to the full elucidation of the latter.

161151

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

DATE DUE

SEP 01 1998

SRLF
2 WEEK LOAN

PAMPHLET BINDER
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

PK 481. W61

3 1158 01239 743

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 000 356 514 0

University
Southern
Library