

Accentuation in the technique of the Vedic poets

ALEXANDER LUBOTSKY

1. The role of accentuation in the Vedic poetics has never been investigated. Handbooks and studies on the metre and versification of the Ṛgveda (RV) only mention that accents have no impact on the metre. This is certainly correct, but poetics has more aspects than merely metre. Vedic Sanskrit had pitch accent, and a sequence of accents represented an accentual contour, a “melody”. By repeating or varying this melody poets could create different effects. The aim of this article is to demonstrate the relevance of accentuation for the technique of the Vedic poets. I shall first give a short account of Vedic accentuation and metre, followed by a survey of accentual poetical devices on the basis of examples taken from the second Maṇḍala of the RV. Finally, I shall analyze four Indra-hymns of this Maṇḍala, viz. 2.12 – 2.15.

2. Vedic accentuation is known from accentuated manuscripts, grammatical treatises and modern recitation. Vedic accent was a pitch accent. The main accent of a word is termed *udātta* ‘raised’ or ‘rising’ by Pāṇini. The pitch of the syllable immediately following the *udātta* is called *svarita* and is described by Pāṇini as a combination of *udātta* and *anudātta* ‘not raised’, which is the term Pāṇini used for the other syllables. The *svarita* is thus a non-autonomous falling accent, marking the transition from a high to a low syllable. The *svarita* becomes an independent accent when the preceding *udātta* syllable is lost through contraction (e.g., *súvar* > *svār*). Independent *svaritas* in the RV are rare because contractions are generally of a later date.¹ The syllable preceding the *udātta* or independent *svarita* was pronounced lower than the others and is termed by Pāṇini *sannatara* ‘lower’.²

¹ In the oldest parts of the RV the contraction of *-íy V-* to *-yV-* is only attested with the preverb *abhí*, e.g. 2.26.1b *abhy ásat*. The independent *svarita* further occurs in neuters of adjectives in *-yā-* = *-íya-*, e.g. *asuryā-* adj. ‘of the Asuras’, which must be pronounced in four syllables (*asuríya-*), but neuter *asuryā-* in three syllables (cf. Seebold 1972: 243ff). It is unclear how to account for this phenomenon. For the phonetic realization of these cases cf. below.

² From the description of the Vedic accentual system by Pāṇini and the Prāṭisākhya it follows that the *udātta* was a rising accent and not just high, as is often suggested. This is confirmed by the accentual marks of the manuscripts, which mark the *sannatara* by a horizontal stroke below the line and mark the *udātta* or the *svarita* by a vertical stroke above the line. The fall of the pitch (*sannatara*) before the main accent (*udātta* or independent *svarita*) was essential for the correct understanding of the text, and in the sequence *kákaká* the middle syllable is a *sannatara* and not *svarita*. For more information on the Vedic accents and their realization in modern recitation I refer the reader to Howard 1986.

It follows that if we know the place of the main accent (*udātta*), the assignment of the other accents is automatic (except for a few cases of the independent *svarita*). Writing “A” for an accented syllable and “a” for an unaccented one, we can represent the accentual contour of a verse as a sequence of these two symbols, e.g.

516

2.14.6c *yó varcínaḥ śatám índraḥ saḥásram* AaAaaAAaaAa

For the independent *svarita* I shall use the symbol “S”.

3. Vedic metre is based on a syllabic principle, being determined by the number of syllables in a *pāda* (verse) and by the number of *pādas* in a stanza. The most common metres of the RV are *triṣṭubh* (4 *pādas* of 11 syllables), *jagatī* (4 *pādas* of 12 syllables), *gāyatrī* (3 *pādas* of 8 syllables) and *anuṣṭubh* (4 *pādas* of 8 syllables). In metres containing four *pādas*, *pādas a* and *b* and *pādas c* and *d* form a hemistich. The structure of a *pāda* is based on the sequence of long and short syllables. Long are syllables containing a long vowel, a diphthong or a short vowel followed by two or more consonants. The other syllables are short. There is a tendency towards a iambic rhythm, i.e. the even syllables are mostly long, but only the rhythm of the end of a *pāda* is fixed. The end of a *pāda* with the fixed rhythm is called ‘cadence’ and comprises the last four syllables of *pādas* of 8 and 11 syllables and the last five syllables of *pādas* of 12 syllables. The quality of the final syllable of a *pāda* is aneeps. *Pādas* of 11 or 12 syllables have a caesura after the fourth or the fifth syllable.

The metre of the RV shows that the original text had sometimes more and sometimes less syllables than the text we now have. Restoration of extra syllables is possible in several cases: restoration of a late contraction (e.g. *-aḥ a- for -o ’-), restoration of *-CRR- for -CR- (e.g. *-Ciy-, *-Cuv- for -Cy-, -Cv-), restoration of a hiatus within a long vowel or diphthong. *Pādas* with too many syllables are rare: the metre shows that in junctures -ā̃ ṛ- contraction to -ar- took place, whereas we find uncontracted -a ṛ- in the text; moreover, some -iya- and -uva- sequences must be read -ya- and -va-.

The text below will be presented in the metrical form, i.e. divided in *pādas*, with the caesura indicated by a comma, with necessary omissions and restorations. Vowels to be omitted are put in square brackets (e.g. bh[i]yásam), contractions of -ā̃ ṛ- to -ar- are written -a ṛ-. Vowels to be restored are written in the superscript (e.g. sūrⁱyaḥ), in round brackets (e.g. íśiṣe (a)yā̃), or with a dash (e.g. vṛṣā-ájani for vṛṣā̃jani).

4. The accentual contour of a *pāda* will thus appear as a sequence of symbols “A” and “a”. For the sake of brevity I shall use the term “melody” for any sequence of accents within a *pāda*. As a syllable can be either accented or unaccented, a *pāda* of 12 syllables can theoretically have $2^{12} = 4096$ melodies, but there are several restrictions. First, every *pāda* has at least one A because the vocatives and the finite verbs of principal sentences, which are normally unaccented,

517

are accented when they stand at the beginning of a pāda. This also means that long sequences of unaccented syllables at the beginning of a pāda are rare. For instance, in Maṇḍala II we find four consecutive unaccented syllables in this position only three times (2.9.1d *sahasrambharāḥ*, 2.13.11a *supravācanām*, 2.32.5d *sahasrapoṣām*). Secondly, as a word has normally one accent, sequences of several consecutive accented syllables are rare although there is no theoretical restriction. In Maṇḍala II the longest sequence is four (occurring only three times), but in Maṇḍala X I also found sequences of five consecutive accented syllables (10.55.6c *yāc cikēta*, *satyām it tān nā mógham*; 10.71.9a *imé yé nárvañi, nā parás cáranti*).

5. Accentuation was used by the Ṛgvedic poets in several ways. In this section I would like to illustrate a number of the most common poetical devices. All examples are taken from the second Maṇḍala.

A. PĀDA LINKING.

The accentual contour of pāda, its melody, is often repeated in another pāda of the same stanza, linking these pādas, as it were. Repetition of the melody of the whole pāda is rare, but repetition of long sequences is very frequent. The question is when is repetition significant and intentional. At first it is always guesswork. For metres of eleven or twelve syllables (*triṣṭubh* and *jagatī*) I have normally considered repetition of sequences of at least seven accents as significant. The sequences of seven accents or more which are repeated are underlined in *all* examples. However, repetition of shorter sequences can be relevant too if these sequences are unusual (for examples see below). I have left out of consideration hymns written in metres of eight syllables (*gāyatrī* and *anuṣṭubh*) because in shorter pādas repetition of shorter sequences was used and during the first analysis it is often difficult to tell whether or not repetition is due to chance.

We begin with a rather extreme example from hymn 2.27:

2.27.13a	śúcir apāḥ, sūyávasā ádabdha	<u>AaaAaAaaAaa</u>
b	úpa kṣeti, vṛddhá ^á vayāḥ suvíraḥ /	<u>AaaaaAaaaAa</u>
c	nákiṣ ṭam ghnant ^í y, ántito ná dūrād	<u>AaaaaAaaAaA</u>
d	yá ádityānām, bhávati práñītau //	<u>AaaAaAaaAaa</u>
2.27.14a	ádite mítra, váruṇotá mṛḷa	<u>AaaAaAaaAaa</u>
b	yád vo vayám, cakṛmá kác cid ágaḥ /	<u>AaaAaaAaAaAa</u>
c	ur ^í v aśyām, ábhayaṃ jyótir indra	a <u>AaaAaaAaaa</u>
d	má no dīrghá, abhí nasan támisrāḥ //	<u>AaaAaAaaAaa</u>

We see that the melody of pādas *a* and *d* of both stanzas is identical. Moreover, pādas *b* and *c* are linked, too: in st. 13 a sequence of eight accents is repeated³, in st. 14 a sequence of seven accents. In order to save space, I shall sometimes use formulaic notation. Linking in st. 14, for instance, can be written in a formula $a1d1x11, b1c2x7$, which must be read as ‘two identical sequences of eleven accents in pādas *a* and *d*, to count from the first syllable of *a* and the first syllable of *d*; two identical sequences of seven accents in pādas *b* and *c*, to count from the first syllable of *b* and the second syllable of *c*.’

Here we see linking of pādas *ad* and *bc*, but the other combinations are just as frequent. The following example illustrates pāda linking *ab/cd* ($a1b1x7, c1d2x10$). An alternative analysis would be $b4c2d3x8$, i.e. a common sequence of eight syllables in three pādas.

2.28.7 a	mā́ no vadháir, varuṇa yé ta iṣṭāv́	<u>AaaAaaaAaaA</u>
b	énaḥ kṛṇvántam, asura bhrīṇánti /	<u>AaaAaaaaAa</u>
c	mā́ jyótiṣaḥ, pravasaṭhāni ganma	<u>AAaaaaAaaa</u>
d	ví ṣū mṛdhaḥ, śísraṭho jīvase naḥ //	<u>AAaaaaAaa</u>

As stated above, I considered repetition of sequences of at least seven accents significant, but there are sequences of five accents which are so rare that their repetition within a stanza cannot be considered accidental. Cf. the following example:

2.26.1 a	rjúr íc cháṃso, vanavad vanuṣyató	<u>aAAAaaaaaaaA</u>
b	devayánn íd, ádevayantam abhy`asat /	<u>aaAAAaaaaSa</u>
c	suprāv́ir íd, vanavat pṛtsú duṣṭaram	<u>aaAAAaaaAaAa</u>
d	yájved áyajyor, ví bhajāti bhójanam //	<u>AAAaaAaaaAaa</u>

It is hardly open to doubt that occurrence of three sequences of three consecutive accented syllables within one stanza is intentional, the more so because pāda *a* of st. 3 of this short hymn of four stanzas has two more of these groups, cf.

2.26.3a	sá íj jánena, sá visá́ sá jánmanā	<u>AAAaaAaAAAaa</u>
---------	-----------------------------------	---------------------

B. INTERRUPTED SEQUENCES.

The repeated sequences can sometimes be interrupted, i.e. one accent in the middle of a sequence does not match, cf.

³ I am aware of the fact that the last accents of these sequences do not match: in pāda *b* it is anudatta, whereas in pāda *c* it is sannatara. In the beginning I chose for a formal approach and made no difference between “a”s. We do not know whether the poets themselves made this difference, and the final results will not significantly be affected by this negligence anyhow because this concerns only a few cases of the first and the last accent of a sequence. Later we can always refine the analysis.

2.34.12a	té daśagvāḥ, prathamā yajñám ūhire	<u>A A a a a A a A a a a</u>
b	té no hinvantu-, -uśáso v'yuṣṭiṣu /	<u>A a a a a a A a A a a a</u>
c	uśá ná rāmír, aruṇáir áporṇute	<u>a A A a A a a A A a a a</u>
d	mahó jyótiṣā, śucatā góarṇasā //	<u>a A A a a a A A a a a</u>

We here find almost identical melody in pādas *a* and *b*, on the one hand, and in pādas *c* and *d*, on the other. In the first two pādas only the accent of the second syllable does not match, 519 in the last two pādas only the accent of the fifth syllable is different.

Yet another example of the same linking is 2.24.1, where we find a2d1x11 and two identical sequences of five accents in pādas *b* and *c*:

2.24.1 a	sémám avidḍhi, prábhṛtiṃ yá ísiṣe	<u>A A a a a A a a A A a a</u>
b	(a)yá vidhema, návayā mahá girá /	<u>a A a a a A a a a A a A</u>
c	yáthā no mīdhvān, stávate sákhā táva	<u>A a a a A A a a A a A a</u>
d	bṛhaspate, síśadhaḥ sótá no matim //	<u>A a a a A a a A A a a A</u>

C. HEMISTICH LINKING.

This is a variant of pāda linking when the beginning of pādas *a* and *c* and the end of pādas *b* and *d* have the same melody, i.e. the beginning and the end of both hemistichs is identical, cf.

2.2.2 a	abhi tvā náktir, uśáso vavāsire	<u>a A a A a a A a a a a a</u>
b	(á)gne vatsám ná, svásareṣu dhenávaḥ /	<u>A a a A A A a a a a A a</u>
c	divá ivéd, aratír mánuṣā yugá-	<u>a A a A a a A A a a a A</u>
d	-á kṣápo bhāsi, puruvāra samyátaḥ //	<u>A A a a a a a a a a A a</u>

In a fairly common variant of hemistich linking, the melody of the final pāda is shifted one syllable to the right, cf.:

2.35.7 a	svá á dáme, sudúghā yásya dhenúḥ	<u>A A A a a A a A a a A</u>
b	svadhám pīpāya, subh ^ú v ánnam atti /	<u>a A a a a a A A a a a</u>
c	só [a]pām nápād, ūrjáyann aps ^ú v antár	<u>A A A a a A a A a a A</u>
d	vasudéyāya, vidhaté ví bhāti //	<u>aa A a a a a A A a a</u>

D. ACCENTUAL MOTIFS.

In several stanzas repetition of an accentual motif of five or six accents seems more essential than pāda linking. For instance, in st. 4-6 of hymn 2.36, the motif **AaaAaa** is repeated three or even four times in every stanza (this motif is printed bold, pāda linking is underlined, as usual):

2.36.4 a	á vakṣi devám̃, ihá vipra yáḥṣi ca-	AaaaAaAaaAaa
b	-uśán hotar, ní śadā yóniṣu triṣú /	aAaaAaaAaaaA
c	práti vīhi, prásthitaṃ somíyám mádhu	AaaaAaaaaAAa
d	píbāgnīdhrāt, táva bhāgāsya tṛṇuhi //	A <u>AaaAaaAaaaa</u>
2.36.5 a	eṣá syá te, tan ^ú vo nṛmṇavárdhanaḥ	aA <u>AaaAaaaAaa</u>
b	sáha ójaḥ, pradívi bāh ^u vór hitaḥ /	Aa <u>AaaAaaaAaA</u>
c	túbhyaṃ sutó, maghavan túbhyaṃ ábhṛtas	<u>AaaAaaaAaAaa</u>
d	t ^u vám asya, bráhmaṇād á tṛpát piba //	aAaaAaaAaAaa
2.36.6 a	juṣéthāṃ yajñám, bódhataṃ hávasya me	aAaaA <u>AaaAaaa</u>
b	sattó hotā, nivídaḥ pūrv ^{yá} ánu /	aA <u>AaaAaaaAaa</u>
c	ácchā rájánā, náma et ^y ávṛtam	AaAaaAaaaaAa
d	prasāstrād á, píbatam̃ somíyám mádhu //	aaAaaaaaaAAa

520

For further examples of accentual motifs see § 6 below.

E. ACCUMULATION OF ACCENTED SYLLABLES.

Sometimes we find several, mostly consecutive pādas with many accented syllables. The average number of accented syllables per pāda is approximately 3,5 in *triṣṭubh* and 4 in *jagatī*, so that occurrence of five and more accents in a pāda may be considered as marked. In hymn 2.4, consisting of nine stanzas and written in *triṣṭubh*, pādas 5d and 6a have six accents, then follow three “normal” pādas and then a pāda with seven accents, cf.

2.4.5 d	jujur ^u vám̃, yó múhur á yúvā bhút //	aaaAAaAAaA
6 a	á yó vānā, tātrṣāṇó ná bhāti	AAAAaaaAAaA
b	v ^a ar ṇá pathá, ráth ⁱ yeva svānīt /	aAAaAAaaaaa
c	kṛṣṇ ^a adhvā, tápū raṇvās ciketa	aAaaAaaAaaa
d	d ⁱ yaúr iva, smáyamāno nábhobhiḥ //	aAaaAaaaAaa
7 a	sá yó v ^y ásthād, abhí dáḥṣad urvīm	AAAAaaAAaaA

It seems to me that what is essential here is not pāda linking but the accumulation of accented syllables which creates a special effect.

F. ACCENTUAL RHYME.

Rhyme as a device for linking pādas is rare in the RV, and accentual rhyme is rare, too. Nevertheless, there are some interesting examples of it. Consider the beginning of hymn 2.31:

2.31.1 a	asmākam mitrā, varuṇāvataṃ rātham	aAaaaaaaaAa
b	ādityāi rudrair, vāsubhiḥ sacābhuvā /	aaAaAaaaaAa
c	prā yād vāyo nā, pāptan vāsmanas pari	AAAaAAaAaaAa
d	śravasyāvo, hr̥ṣṭivanto vanarśadaḥ //	aaAaAaaaaAa

(Note the interrupted sequence in pādas *b* and *d* and seven accented syllables in pāda *c*.) All pādas of this stanza end in aaAa, but we could ascribe it to chance if stanza 5 of the same hymn did not have the same accentual rhyme:

2.31.5 a	utā tyē devī, subhāge mithūdṛśā-	aAAaAaAaaaAa
b	-uśāsānaktā, jāgatām apījūvā /	aAaAaAaaaaAa
c	stuṣē yād vām, pṛthivi nāvyaśā vāca	aAaaaaAaaAa
d	sthātuś ca vāyas, trivayā upastīre //	aAaAaAaaaaAa

Moreover, this accentual rhyme is attested in pādas *bd* of st. 2, pādas *bc* of st. 3 and pādas *ab* of st. 4. Thus, in the first 20 pādas of this hymn the accentual rhyme aaAa occurs 14 times. 521

G. STYLISTIC REPETITION.

Stylistic repetition in the Veda has been investigated in great detail by Gonda (1959). Gonda adduced many Ṛgvedic examples of different types of repetition, but as he omitted accent marks, he did not notice that pādas (or parts of a pāda) containing repetitions are very often accompanied by the same accentual contour. Here are some examples.

Anaphora (repetition of words at the beginning of pādas) is rather frequent in the RV. The part of the pāda before the caesura then often has an identical accentual contour, cf. the following three examples taken from hymn 2.11:

2.11.4 a	śubhrāṃ nū te, śuśmaṃ vardhāyantaḥ	aAAaAaaAaa
b	śubhrāṃ vājram, bāh ^u vōr dādhanāḥ /	aAAaaaAAaa
2.11.6 a	stāvā nū ta, [indra] pūrv ⁱ yā mahān ⁱ y	AaAa[aa]aaAaAa ⁴
b	utā stavāma, nūtanā kṛtāni /	aAaaaAaaaAa
c	stāvā vājram, bāh ^u vōr uśantaṃ	AaAaaaAaAa
d	stāvā hārī, sūr ⁱ yasya ketū //	AaAaAaaaaA
2.11.14a	rāsi kṣāyaṃ, rāsi mitrām asmē	AaAaAaaAaA
2.11.14b	rāsi śārdha, indra mārutaṃ naḥ /	AaAaaaAaaa

⁴ Oldenberg (Noten ad loc.) suggested to solve the metrical problems of pāda *a* by omitting the vocative *indra* as a late interpolation. If we do this, the accentual contours of pādas *a* and *c* become identical, which may be considered an additional argument for Oldenberg's solution.

Epiphora (repetition of words at the end of pādas):

- 2.34.5d mādhor mādāya, marutaḥ samanyavaḥ // AaAaaaaaaa
 6a á no brāhmāṇi, marutaḥ samanyavo AaAaaaaaaa

Other repetitions:

- 2.27.11d yuṣmānīto, ábhayaṃ jyótir áśyām aAaaAaaAaaa
 2.27.14c ur^uv áśyām, ábhayaṃ jyótir indra aAaaAaaAaaa

Rhyme.

In the following two examples the end rhyme (in the first example) or the “vowel” rhyme (in the second example) are accompanied by an identical melody after the caesura:

- 2.3.6 a sād^hu^v apāṃsi, śanātā na ukṣité aAAaaaAaaaaA
 b uśāsānāktā, vayⁱveva raṇvité aAaAaaAaaaaA
 2.13.9 a śatam vā yasya, dáśa sākam ádⁱya aAaAaAaaAAaa
 b ékasya śruṣṭau, yád dha codám ávitha / AaaaAAaaAAaa

Parallel stanza openings. In hymn 2.11, four stanzas have parallel openings with *ín nú* before the caesura, and in all the four cases the word preceding *ín nú* has the accentual contour aAa, so that the opening has the melody aAaAA:

522

- 2.11.3a ukthē^v *ín nú*, śūra yeṣu cākan aAaAAaaAaaA
 2.11.15a vⁱyānt^v *ín nú*, yeṣu mandasānās aAaAAaaaaA
 2.11.16a br^hhanta *ín nú*, ye te tarutra- aAaAAaaaa
 2.11.17a ugrē^v *ín nú*, śūra mandasānās aAaAAaaaaaA

H. ACCENTUAL ANAGRAMS.

In several manuscripts which have been published only recently (Starobinski 1971), the great Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure advanced a theory according to which several Indo-European poetical traditions shared a common principle of composing poetry, viz. “a method of anagrams”. The poet first chose a key-word, e.g. a name of a god or his own name, and then tried to find words which contained the same sounds as the key-word. In this way, the message of the hymn could be expressed on two different levels: next to the explicit level there was a hidden second level where the key-word appeared in code, as an anagram. This theory has been elaborated by Toporov and Elizarenkova in several articles where they demonstrated the role of the anagrammatical level in the poetics of the RV (cf. Toporov 1965, Elizarenkova – Toporov 1979, its German translation Toporov 1981).

The accentual contour is a suitable device for anagrams. Below I shall discuss several hymns where the accentual contour of the refrain is repeated in other pādas. However, as names generally consist of no more than four-five syllables, it is difficult to demonstrate that a short motif is intentional and represents an anagram. Here I would like to give only one example. The first ten pādas of hymn 2.4, dedicated to Agnī-, begin with aA, and it seems possible that this is a play on the name of the god. It is important that in the first two stanzas the name Agnī- itself is not used in the accentual anagram. When it finally appears at the beginning of st. 3, the spell is broken and the play stops (cf. comparable observations about “sound” anagrams in Toporov 1981: 239f.).

2.4.1	a	huvé vaḥ, sudyót ^á mānaṃ suvr̥ktīm	<u>aAaaAaaaaA</u>
	b	visām agnīm, átithim suprayásam /	<u>aAaAAaaaaAa</u>
	c	mitrá iva, yó didhiṣāy ^í yo bhūd	<u>aAaaAaaAaaA</u>
	d	devá ádeve, jáne jātavedāḥ //	<u>aAAaaAaaAaa</u>
2.4.2	a	imāṃ vidhānto, ap ^á aṃ sadhāsthe	<u>aAaAaaaAaAa</u>
	b	dvitādadhur, bhṛḡgavo vikṣ ^ú v āyoh /	<u>aAaaAaaaAaA</u>
	c	eṣá visvān ^í y, abh ^í y astu bhúmā	<u>aAAaaaAaaAa</u>
	d	devānām agnīr, aratīr jīrās ^á vaḥ //	<u>aAaaAaaAaAa</u>
2.4.3	a	agnīm devāso, mānuṣīṣu vikṣú	<u>aAaAaAaaaaA</u>
	b	priyāṃ dhuḥ, kṣeṣ ^í yānto ná mitráṃ /	<u>aAaaaAaAaA</u>
	c	sá dīdayad, usatīr ūrm ^í yā á	<u>AaaaaaAAaaA</u>
	d	dakṣāy ^í yo, yó dāsvate dáma á //	<u>aAaaAAaaAaA</u>

523

6. We shall now look at a few complete hymns in order to get an impression how the accentual poetical devices were used in practice. For this purpose I have chosen four hymns dedicated to Indra (2.12-2.15). These hymns have in common that they all contain a refrain, i.e. several words which are repeated at the end of every stanza (in 2.14 at the beginning of every stanza). These refrains gave the poets an additional possibility to play with accents by repeating the melody of the refrain in other pādas.

Furthermore, the final stanza of the majority of hymns in the second Maṇḍala ends with the pāda *brhád vadema vidáthe suvīrāḥ* “May we, with our valiant sons, out-talk (our rivals)” (for the translation see Kuiper 1974: 131). This final pāda is characteristic for the poets of this Maṇḍala, which belong to the Gṛtsamada family, and is their “seal” as it were (cf. Renou EVP II: 31). Stanzas containing this “seal” link hymns together and actually stand outside the hymn itself. This is confirmed by the fact that these stanzas are often composed in another metre than the rest of the hymn.

The first hymn, viz. 2.12, we shall analyze in some detail, whereas the other hymns will be given with only short comments.

2.12. Triṣṭubh.

This famous hymn contains the refrain *sá janāsa índraḥ* ‘he, O people, is Indra!’ at the end of each stanza, except for the final stanza 15, where pāda *d* is a variant of the usual refrain of the second Maṇḍala. The accentual contour of the refrain and its repetitions are printed bold, pāda linking is indicated by underlining. It goes without saying that some of the repetitions may be due to chance and are not intended as such by the poets.

2.12.1 a	yó jā́tā evá, prathamó mā́nasvān	<u>AaAaAaaAaa</u>
b	devó devā́n, krátunā paryábhūṣat /	aAa <u>AaaaAaa</u>
c	yásya śúṣmād, ródasī ábhyasetām	<u>AaAaAaaAaaa</u>
d	ṛmṇásya mahná, sá janāsa índraḥ //	aAaa <u>AaaaAa</u>

The first stanza shows hemistich linking with the shift by one syllable to the right in pāda *d* (see §5C above). The same accentual device we shall come across in stanzas 10 and 14. In analyzing repetitions of all kinds I have only considered accent sequences within a pāda. If we pay no attention to pāda boundaries and look for repetitions within a hemistich, the number of repetitions would increase considerably. For instance, in this stanza we also see the melody of the refrain *AaaaAa* on the boundary of pādas *a* and *b*.

524

2.12.2 a	yáḥ pṛthivīm, vyáthamānām ádṛmhad	Aaa <u>AaaaAaa</u>
b	yáḥ pārvatān, prākupitām áramṇāt /	<u>AAaaAaaaAaa</u>
c	yó antāriḡṣam, vimamé varīyo	AaAaaaaAaa
d	yó dyām ástabhnāt, sá janāsa índraḥ //	<u>AAaaAaaaAa</u>

Pādas *a* and *b* have the same melody after the caesura, which emphasizes the parallel structure of these two pādas. The pāda linking *bd* shows the same shift by one syllable to the right as in st. 1.

2.12.3 a	yó hatvā́him, áriṇāt saptá síndhūn	<u>AaAaAaaaAaa</u>
b	yó gá udájad, apadhá valásya /	AAa <u>AaaaAaAa</u>
c	yó ásmanor, antār agníṃ jajāna	<u>AAaaaAaAaAa</u>
d	saṃvṛk samatsu, sá janāsa índraḥ //	aAaAa <u>AaaaAa</u>

A comparable shift is found here in pādas *a* and *d* (a1d2x9). Also pādas *b* and *c* have a long sequence in common (b3c2x8).

2.12.4 a	yénemá vísvā, cyávanā kṛtāni	AaAa <u>AaaaAa</u>
b	yó dāsam varṇam, ádharam ḡhākaḥ /	AAaAaAaaAaa
c	śvaghnīva yó, jigīvām lakṣam ádad	<u>aAaAaaAaAaa</u>
d	aryáḥ puṣtāni, sá janāsa índraḥ //	aAaAa <u>AaaaAa</u>

Pāda linking *ad/bc*. The final pāda of this stanza repeats the melody of the final pāda of the previous stanza. With stanza 4 ends the opening of the hymn, dedicated to the heroic deeds of Indra in the past. In st. 3 and 4 we see a remarkable number of sequences Aa (4 in every line) and the end rhyme in -Aa. It seems probable that the accentual contour Aa represents an anagram, the poets hinting at the melody of the name *Índra-*. Note also the accumulation of accented syllables: beginning with pāda *d* of st. 2 we find 5-5-5-5-4-5-6-5-4 accented syllables in a pāda.

2.12.5 a	yám smā pṛcchānti, kúha séti ghorám	AaaAaAaAaaA
b	utém āhur, náśó astít'y enam /	aAaaAaAaAaa
c	só [a]ryah puṣṭír, víja ivá mināti	AAaAAaaAaaa
d	śrād asmai dhatta, sá janāsa índrah //	Aaaaa AaaaAa

In this stanza the accentual contour of the refrain is not repeated, and there are no special accentual effects. Repetition of sequences of longer than 5 accents is not attested. This state of affairs is in correspondence with the contents of the stanza: “About whom, the terrible one, they ask, ‘Where is he?’, and they say of him, ‘He is not there’, he who diminishes the riches of a stranger, as gambling (?) does – believe in him, he, O people, is Indra!” In other words, in stanza 5 Indra is in a way absent, which is emphasized by the accentual structure.

525

2.12.6 a	yó radhrásya, coditá yáh kṛśásya	AaAaaaAaAa
b	yó brahmāno, nádhamānasya kīrēḥ /	AaAaAaaaaA
c	yuktágrāvṇo, yó (a)vitá susiprah	aAaaAaaAaaA
d	sutásomasya, sá janāsa índrah //	aAaaa AaaaAa
2.12.7 a	yásyáśvāsaḥ, pradísi yásya gávo	AAaaaAaAaAa
b	yásya grāmā, yásya vísve rathāsaḥ /	AaAaAaAaAaa
c	yáh sūr'yam, yá uśasaṃ jajāna	AAaaAaAaaAa
d	yó apám netá, sá janāsa índrah //	AaAaA AaaaAa

In stanzas 6 and 7 we see another accentual trick: *yáh* is combined with a word of the structure aAa or *yásya* + Aa, which results in a sequence AaAa. There are three such groups in st. 6 and five in st. 7. This device again reproduces the accentual anagram of Indra, viz. Aa (in 7b it is repeated five times, which is the maximum!). Note that there is no significant pāda linking in st. 5-7.

2.12.8 a	yám krāndasī, samyatī vihváyete	<u>AAaaaaAaAaa</u>
b	pāre (á)vara, ubháyā amitrāḥ /	Aa AaaaAaAa
c	samānam cid, ratham ātasthivāmsā	aaAa <u>AAAAAa</u>
d	nānā havete, sá janāsa índrah //	<u>AaaaaAaaaAa</u>

2.12.9 a	yásmān ná rté, vijáyante jánāso	AaAAaAaaAaa
b	yám yúdhya ^u mānā, ávase hávante /	AAaaaAaaAaa
c	yó víśvasya, pratimānam babhúva	AAaaaaAaaAa
d	yó acyutacyút, sá janāsa índraḥ //	AaaaAAaaaAa

Alternatively, one could analyze pāda linking as a5b5c6x6.

2.12.10 a	yáḥ śásvato, máh ⁱ y éno dádhānān	AAaaAaAaAaa
b	ámanyamānān, chár ^u vā jaghāna /	AaaaaAAaaAa
c	yáḥ śárdhate, nānudādāti śṛdhyām	AAaaAaAaaaA
d	yó dāsyor hantā, sá janāsa índraḥ //	AAaaAAaaaAa

We find here hemistich linking.

2.12.11 a	yáḥ śámbaram, párvateṣu kṣiyāntam	AAaaAaaaaAa
b	catvāriṃśyām, śarād ⁱ y anvāvindat /	aaaAAaAaaAaa
c	ojāyamānam, yó áhiṃ jaghāna	aaAaaAAaaAa
d	dānum śáyānam, sá janāsa índraḥ //	AaAaaAAaaAa

In stanzas 8-11, the pronoun *yáḥ* is followed by a noun of the structure Aa(a), which creates a new pattern AAaa: once in st. 8, twice in st. 9 and 11, three times in st. 10. Note that these structures in stanzas 10 and 11 are also linked by alliteration: *yáḥ śásvato*, *yáḥ śárdhate*, *yáḥ śámbaram*.

2.12.12 a	yáḥ saptarásmir, vṛṣabhás túviṣmān	AaAaaaaAAaa
b	avásṛjat, sártave saptá síndhūn /	aAaaAaaaAAa
c	yó rauhiṇām, ásphurad vájrabāhur	AaaAAaaAaaa
d	dyām ārohantam, sá janāsa índraḥ //	AaAaaAAaaAa
2.12.13 a	dyāvā cid asmai, pṛthivī namete	AaaaaaaAaaa
b	śúṣmāc cid asya, párvatā bhayante /	AaaaaAaaaaa
c	yáḥ somapá, nicitó vájrabāhur	AaaAaaAAaaa
d	yó vájrahastah, sá janāsa índraḥ //	AAaaaAAaaAa

526

The similar openings of pādas *a* and *b* are linked by the same melody. The end of pāda *c* is reflected in the beginning of pāda *d*. The same device has been used in the following stanza, too.

2.12.14 a	yáḥ sunvāntam, ávati yáḥ pácantam	AaAaAaaAAaa
b	yáḥ śámśantam, yáḥ śásamānām ūtí /	AAaaAAaaAAa
c	yásya bráhma, vārdhanam yásya sómo	AAaaAaaAaAa
d	yásyedam rádhah, sá janāsa índraḥ //	AaAAaAAaaAa

Stanza 14 is actually the final stanza of the hymn (st. 15 is the refrain, linking together different hymns of the Maṇḍala) and has a similar melodic structure as that of st. 1. Both stanzas show hemistich linking and their first pādas have an identical melody. The circle is closed, and for the last time we come across the specific accentual devices of this hymn: repetition of the same melody at the end of pāda *a* and at the beginning of pāda *b*, *yásya bráhma ... yásya sómo yásyedam* forming the group AaA(a), culminating in pāda *c* in 5 times of Aa, the accentual anagram of *índra-*.

2.12.15a	yāḥ sunvaté, pácate dudhrá á cid	<u>AaaAAaaaAAa</u>
b	vājam dārdarṣi, sá kílāsi satyāḥ /	Aa <u>AaaAAaaaA</u>
c	vayam ta indra, vísvāha priyāsaḥ	aAaaaaAaaAa
d	suvīrāso, vidātham á vadema //	aAaaaAaAaaa

This stanza stands outside the hymn and contains a request for help and prosperity. We see two identical sequences of nine accents in the first two pādas (a1b3x9), which are constructed in such a way that after the sequence in pāda *a* stands *á cid* (Aa), echoed in pāda *b* with *vājam* (Aa), followed by the same sequence of nine accents. The final pāda is peculiar. The normal refrain of Maṇḍala II is *brhád vadema, vidáthe suvīrāḥ* (aAaaaaAaaAa), which occurs in 22 hymns of the total of 43 hymns of this Maṇḍala. This refrain even occurs in hymns which are composed in a different metre, for instance, in the *jagatī* hymns 1 and 2. What then was the reason to put a variant of this refrain in our hymn? It seems probable that through a couple of minor changes the poets could create a line with a sequence AaaaAa, i.e. the last allusion to the refrain of the hymn *sá janāsa índrah*.

2.13. Jagatī, st. 13 triṣṭubh.

527

The refrain *sás'y ukth'yah* 'he is to be praised' occurs for the first time in stanza 2, but its melody (AaaaAa, printed in bold face) appears already three times in st. 1.

2.13.1 a	ṛtúr janitrī, tás'yā apás pári	aAA <u>AaaAaaaAAa</u>
b	makṣú jāta, áviśad yásu vārdhate /	aAaAA <u>AaaAaAaa</u>
c	tād āhaná, abhavat pipyúṣī páyo	AaaAaaaaAaAa
d	(a)mśoḥ pīyūṣam, prathamam tād ukth'yam //	aAaA <u>AaaaAAaAa</u>
2.13.2 a	sadhṛīm á yanti, pári bíbhratīḥ páyo	aAA <u>AaaAaAaaAa</u>
b	vísvāpsn'yāya, prá bharanta bhojanam /	aAaaaA <u>aaaAaa</u>
c	samāno ádhvā, pravatām anuṣyāde	aaAA <u>AaaAaaaAa</u>
d	yás tākṛṇoḥ, prathamam sás'y ukth'yah //	AAaaaaAA <u>AaaAa</u>
2.13.3 a	án ^u v éko, vadati yád dádati tād	AaA <u>aaaaAAaaaA</u>
b	rūpā minán, tadapā éka iyate /	aAaAA <u>AaaAaaaa</u>
c	vísvā ékasya, vinúdas titikṣate	<u>AaAaaaAaaaaa</u>
d	yás tākṛṇoḥ, prathamam sás'y ukth'yah //	AAaaaaAA <u>AaaAa</u>

Pādas 2d = 3d and 3a have a common sequence of ten accents. Pādas *b* and *c* have an interrupted sequence of 10 accents in common.

2.13.4 a	prajābhyah puṣṭīm, vibhājanta āsate	<u>aAaaAaAaaaa</u>
b	rayīm [i]va pṛṣṭhām, prabhāvanta āyaté /	<u>aAaaAaAaaaaA</u>
c	āsinvan dāmṣṭraih, pitúr atti bhójanam	<u>AaaAaaAaaAaa</u>
d	yás tākṛṇoh, prathamam sās'y ukth'yah //	<u>AAaaaaAAaaAa</u>

Pāda linking in the first two pādas emphasizes the rhyming structures (partly consonantal and partly vocalic rhymes) and offers confirmation for the unusual *Verschleifung* in pāda *b*, viz. *rayīm [i]va* (cf. Oldenberg, *Noten ad loc.*).

2.13.5 a	ādhākṛṇoh, pṛthivīm samdṛṣe divé	<u>AaaaaAaAaaA</u>
b	yó dhautīnām, ahihan[n] āriṇak pathāḥ /	<u>AaaAaaaAaaaA</u>
c	tām tvā stōmebhir, udābhir ná vājīnam	<u>AaAaaaAaAaAa</u>
d	devam devā, ajanan sās'y ukth'yah //	<u>aAaAaaaAaaAa</u>
2.13.6 a	yó bhójanam ca, dāyase ca vārdhanam	<u>AAaaaAaaaAaa</u>
b	ārdrād ā sūṣkam, mādhumad dudōhitha /	<u>aAAaAaaaAaa</u>
c	sā sevadhīm, ní dadhiṣe vivāsvati	<u>AaaAAaaaaAaa</u>
d	vīsvasyaika, īṣiṣe sās'y ukth'yah //	<u>AaAaaaaAaaAa</u>

The second hemistich shows two equal sequences of ten accents AaaaaAaaAa.

2.13.7 a	yāḥ puṣpīṇīs ca, pras ^u vaś ca dhārmaṇā-	<u>AaAaaaAaaAaa</u>
b	-ādhi dāne, v'y avānīr ādhārayah /	<u>AaAaAaAaAaaa</u>
c	yās cāsamā, ajano didyūto divā	<u>AAaaAaaaAaaA</u>
d	urūr ūrvām, abhītaḥ sās'y ukth'yah //	<u>aAaAaAaAaaAa</u>
2.13.8 a	yó nārmaram, sahāvasum nīhantave	<u>AaaAaAaaAaaa</u>
b	pṛkṣāya ca, dāsāveśāya cāvahaḥ /	<u>aAaaaAaaaAaa</u>
c	ūrjayantyā, apariviṣtam āś'yam	<u>aAaaAaaaaAa</u>
d	utāivādyā, purukṛt sās'y ukth'yah //	<u>aAAaaaaAaaAa</u>
2.13.9 a	śatam vā yasya, dāsa sākām ād'ya	<u>aAaAaAaaAaaa</u>
b	ékasya sruṣṭau, yād dha codām āvitha /	<u>AaaaAAaaAaaa</u>
c	arajjau dās'yūn, sām unab dabhītaye	<u>aaAAaAaaaAaa</u>
d	suprāv'yo, abhavaḥ sās'y ukth'yah //	<u>aaAaaaaAaaAa</u>

The part after the caesura in pādas *a* and *b* contains almost identical vowels and the same melody.

2.13.10 a	vīsvéd ānu, rodhanā asya paums'yam	<u>AAaaaaAaaAaa</u>
b	dadūr asmai, dadhiré kṛtnāve dhānam /	<u>aAaaaaAaAaAa</u>
c	ṣaḥ astabhna, viṣṭīrah pañca samdṛṣah	<u>AaaaaAaAaaAa</u>
d	pari paró, abhavaḥ sās'y ukth'yah //	<u>AaaAaaaAaaAa</u>

2.13.11 a	supravācanāṃ, tāva vīra vīrīyaṃ	aaaaAAaaaaAa
b	yad ēkena, krātunā vindāse vāsu /	AAaaAaaaAaAa
c	jātūṣṭhirasya, prā vāyaḥ sāhasvato	aAaaaAAaAaaa
d	yā cakārtha, śendra vīsvāsīy ukthīyaḥ //	AaAaAaAaaaAa

In this stanza a variant of the refrain is used. The reason for this change remains unclear to me. Note, however, that the final pāda of this and the following stanzas contains five groups Aa, an anagram of Índra-.

2.13.12 a	áramayaḥ, sárapasas tárāya kām	AaaaAaaaAaaA
b	turvītaye ca, vayīyāya ca srutīm /	aAaaaaAaaaaA
c	nīcā śantam, úd anayaḥ parāvṛjam	aAAaAaaaaAa
d	prāndhām sronām, śravāyan sāsīy ukthīyaḥ //	AAaAaAa AaAa

There is no pāda linking in this stanza because in pāda *a* the distance between the accented syllables is three unaccented syllables, in pāda *b* four, in pāda *c* one and five unaccented syllables, whereas in pāda *d* with its six accents the distance is one or two unaccented syllables. It seems possible that this distribution is intentional.

2.13.13 a	asmábhyaṃ tād, vaso dānāya rādhaḥ	aAaAaaaAaAa
b	sám arthayasa, bahú te vasavyām /	AaaaaAaaaS
c	índra yac citrām, śravasyā ánu dyūn	AaAaAaaAAaA
d	bṛhád vademā, vidáthe suvīrāḥ //	aAaaaaAaaAa

529

The final stanza contains the refrain of the second Maṇḍala, the “seal” of the Grtsamada family, and it is to be expected that the melody of this refrain be repeated in the other pādas. The study of the refrains of this Maṇḍala (which I cannot present here) shows that in general this is the case. However, in this concrete stanza there seems to be no accentual play on the melody of the refrain. The only place where we find repetition of the refrain is pāda *b* if we assume that the independent svarita S “rhymes” with Aa in the RV. It has usually been assumed that neuters in -yā- must be changed into *-yā- (for the material and a discussion of the older literature cf. Seebold 1972: 243ff.; see also fn. 1), but it is always better to keep to the original text. The whole problem requires further investigation, and accentual repetitions may provide additional arguments.

2.14. Triṣṭubh.

All stanzas of this hymn (except for the final one) begin with the vocative plural *ádhvaryavaḥ* ‘O Adhvaryus’, which functions as a refrain (Aaaa, printed bold below).

The first pādas of stanzas 1 and 2, 3 and 4, 8 and 9 have an identical melody. The first pāda of st. 5 has almost the same melody as st. 3-4 (only the accent of the seventh syllable does not match), while the first pādas of st. 6 and 7 also have a similar melody (the accent of the tenth

syllable does not match). The melody of the first pādas thus divides the hymn in five parts: st. 1-2, st. 3-5, st. 6-7, st. 8-9 and st. 10-11. This division is further confirmed by other correspondences within each part. St. 1-2 have the words *pītīm asya* ‘his drink’ in common; st. 3-5 are united by the formula *yāḥ* + NPr. + *jaghāna* ‘who slayed NPr.’ at the end of pāda *a*; st. 6-7 have two formulas in common, viz. *śatām sahasram avapat* ‘he sowed (the earth) with hundred, thousand (enemies)’ and *bhāratā sōmam asmai* ‘bring Soma to him!’ at the end of pāda *d*; st. 8-9 have a similar final pāda *īndrāya sōmam ... juhota* ‘pour Soma for Indra!’; and, finally, st. 10-11 show a common formula *prṇatā īndram sōmebhir* ‘fill Indra with streams of Soma!’.

It is further noteworthy that the great majority of pādas begins with an accented syllable, viz. 37 of the total of 44.

St. 3 shows accumulation of accented syllables (4-7-5-6 accents in a pāda).

I have indicated all identical sequences of seven accents and more by underlining, but pāda linking as a poetical device is clearly of minor importance to this hymn.

2.14.1 a	ādhvaryavo, bhāratēndrāya sōmam	<u>Aaaa</u> AaAaaAa
b	āmatrebhiḥ, siñcatā mādyam āndhaḥ /	<u>Aaaaaa</u> AaAa
c	kāmī hī vīraḥ, śadam asya pītīm	aAAaA <u>Aaaaa</u> A
d	juhōta vṛṣṇe, tad id eṣā vaṣṭi //	aAaAaAAaAaa
2.14.2 a	ādhvaryavo, yō apō vavrivāṃsam	<u>Aaaa</u> AaAaaAa
b	vṛtrāṃ jaghāna-, -asānyeva vṛkṣām /	aAaAaa <u>Aaaa</u> A
c	tāsmā etām, bhārata tadvaśāyam	Aaa <u>Aaaaa</u> Aa
d	eṣā īndro, arhati pītīm asya //	aA <u>Aaaaa</u> Aaa
2.14.3 a	ādhvaryavo, yō dṛbhīkam jaghāna	<u>Aaaa</u> AAaaaAa
b	yō gā udājad, āpa hī valām vaḥ /	AAaAaAaAaAA
c	tāsmā etām, antārikṣe nā vātam	AaaAaAaaAAa
d	īndraṃ sōmair, orṇuta jūr nā vastraiḥ //	AaAaAaaAAaA
2.14.4 a	ādhvaryavo, yā uraṇam jaghāna	<u>Aaaa</u> AAaaaAa
b	nāva cakhvāṃsam, navatim ca bāhūn /	Aaa <u>Aaaa</u> AaaA
c	yō ārbudam, āva nīcā babādhe	AAaaAaaAaaA
d	tām īndraṃ, sōmaśya bhr̥thē hinota //	AAa <u>Aaaa</u> Aaaa
2.14.5 a	ādhvaryavo, yāḥ s ^u v āśnam jaghāna	<u>Aaaa</u> AAaAaAa
b	yāḥ sūṣṇam, aśuṣam yō vīyamṣam /	AAaaAaAAaa
c	yāḥ pīprum, nāmucim yō rudhikrām	<u>AAa</u> AaaAaaA
d	tāsmā īndrāya-, -āndhaso juhota //	<u>Aa</u> Aaa <u>Aaaaa</u>
2.14.6 a	ādhvaryavo, yāḥ śatām śambarasya	<u>Aaaa</u> AaAAaaa
b	pūro bibhēda-, -āśmaneva pūrvīḥ /	AaaAa <u>Aaaaa</u> A
c	yō varcīnaḥ, śatām īndraḥ sahasram	AaAaaAAaaAa
d	apāvāpad, bhāratā sōmam asmai //	aAaaAaa <u>Aaaa</u>

2.14.7 a	ádhvaryavo, yáḥ śatám á saháśram	Aaaa AaAaAa
b	bhūmyā upásthe, (á)vapaj jaghanvān /	AaaAa Aaaaa A
c	kútsasyāyōr, atithigváśya vīrān	<u>AaaAaaa</u> AaaA
d	nīy ávr̥ṇag, bháratā sómam asmai //	AAaaAaa Aaaa
2.14.8 a	ádhvaryavo, yán naraḥ kāmáyādhve	Aaaa AaaaAaa
b	śruṣṭī váhanto, naśathā tád índre /	aA Aaaaa AAa
c	gabhastipūtam, bhārata śrutāya-	<u>Aaaaaaaaa</u> Aa
d	-índrāya sómam, yajyavo juhota //	Aaa Aaaaaaaa
2.14.9 a	ádhvaryavaḥ, kártanā sruṣṭim asmai	Aaaa AaaaAaa
b	vāne nīpūtam, vāna ún nayadhvam /	AaAaaAa Aaaa
c	juṣāṇó hástyam, abhī vāvaśe va	aaA <u>AaaAaaa</u>
d	índrāya sómam, madiráṃ juhota //	<u>AaaAaaa</u> Aaaa
2.14.10a	ádhvaryavaḥ, páyasódhar yáthā goḥ	Aaaa AaAaAaA
b	sómebhir ím, pṛṇatā bhojám índram /	Aaaaaaaa AAa
c	védāhám asya, nibhṛtam ma etád	AaAaa Aaaa A
d	dítsantam bhūyo, yajatás ciketa //	<u>AaaAaaa</u> Aaaa
2.14.11a	ádhvaryavo, yó div'yáśya vásvo	Aaaa AaaAaAa
b	yáḥ párthivasya, kṣám'yasya rájā /	<u>AAaaa</u> Aaaa Aa
c	tám úrdaram ná, priṇatā yávena-	AAaa Aaaa Aaa
d	-índram sómebhis, tád apo vo astu //	AaAaa Aaaaa

[2.14.12 = 2.13.13]

2.15. Triṣṭubh.

The hymn proper contains nine stanzas. Stanza 10 is also found at the end of hymns 11 and 16-20 and is thus characteristic of Indra-hymns of the second Maṇḍala. For repetitions of the parts of the Gṛtsamada refrain in other pādas see the comments on 2.13.13 above.

The refrain of hymn 2.15, *sómasya tá, máda índraś cakāra* 'being intoxicated by Soma, Indra performed these (deeds)', appears for the first time in the second stanza, but already in the first stanza its melody is hinted at. The refrain fills the whole pāda, and it certainly is hardly possible to frequently repeat the complete refrain. It seems that the melody of the refrain is divided into two parts, **AaaA** before the caesura (printed bold) and **AaAaaaa** after the caesura (printed bold and in italics). The first part of this melody (**AaaA**) starts st. 3-7 and 9. The melody of the whole refrain is repeated only in st. 5, exactly in the middle of the hymn, which is a marked position (cf. Toporov 1981: 235).

Another typical feature of this hymn are long sequences of unaccented syllables, especially in pādas *b* and *c*.

2.15.1 a	prá ghā n ^u v asya, maható maháni	AaAaaaaAaAa
b	satyā satyāsyā, káraṇāni vocam /	aAaAaAaaaa
c	trikadrūkeṣ ^u v, apibat sutāsyā-	AaaaaaaaaAa
d	-asyā máde, áhim índro jaghāna //	aAAaAaAaaaa
2.15.2 a	avamśé dyām, astabhāyad brhāntam	aaAAaaaaAa
b	ā ródasī, aprṇad antárikṣam /	AAaaaaAaAa
c	sá dhārayat, pṛthivīm paprathac ca	AaaaaAaAaAa
d	sómasya tá, máda índras cakāra //	AaaAaAaaaa
2.15.3 a	sádmeva práco, ví mimāya mánair	AaaAaAaaaAa
b	vājreṇa khān ⁱ y, aṛṇan nadīnām /	AaaAaaaaAa
c	vṛthāsrjat, pathíbhīr dīrghayāthaiḥ	AaaaaAaaaaA
d	sómasya tá, máda índras cakāra //	AaaAaAaaaa
2.15.4 a	sá pravolhṛn, parigatyā dabhīter	AaaAaaAaaAa
b	vīsvam adhāg, āyudham iddhé agnau /	AaaaAaaaAaA
c	sam gobhir āsvair, aṣṛjad ráthebhiḥ	AAaAaaaaAaa
d	sómasya tá, máda índras cakāra //	AaaAaAaaaa
2.15.5 a	sá im mahīm, dhūnim étor aramṇāt	AaaAaAaaaa
b	só asnātṛn, apārayat s ^u vastī /	AaaAaaaaaaA
c	tá utsnáya, rayīm abhī prá tasthuḥ	AaAaaAaAAaa
d	sómasya tá, máda índras cakāra //	AaaAaAaaaa
2.15.6 a	sodañcam śīndhum, ariṇān mahitvā	AaaAaaaaaaA
b	vājreṇāna, uśasaḥ sam pipeṣa /	AaAaaAaAaaa
c	ajavāso, javinībhīr vivṛścān	aaAaaAaaaaA
d	sómasya tá, máda índras cakāra //	AaaAaAaaaa
2.15.7 a	sá vid ^u vām, apagoham kanīnām	AaaAaaaAaAa
b	āvīr bhavann, úd atīṣṭhat parāvṛk /	aAAaAaaaaA
c	prāti sronā, sthād v ⁱ y anāg acaṣṭa	AaaAaAaAaaa
d	sómasya tá, máda índras cakāra //	AaaAaAaaaa
2.15.8 a	bhinād valām, āngirobhīr grṇāno	aAaAaaaaAa
b	vī pārvatasya, dṛmhitān ⁱ y airat /	AAaaaaAaaa
c	riṇāg ródhāmsi, kṛtrīmān ⁱ y eṣām	aAaaaAaaaa
d	sómasya tá máda, índras cakāra //	AaaAaAaaaa
2.15.9 a	svāpnenābhyúpyā, cúmurim dhūnim ca	AaaAaAaaAaA
b	jaghānta dāsyam, prá dabhītim āvaḥ /	aAaAaAaAaaa
c	rambhī cid atra, vivide hīraṇyam	aAaAaaaaAaa
d	sómasya tá, máda índras cakāra //	AaaAaAaaaa

[2.15.10a	nūnám sá te, práti váram jaritré	aAAaAaAaaaA
b	duhīyad indra, dáksīṇā maghónī /	aaAaaAaaaAa
c	śíkṣā stotr̥bhyo, máti dhag bhágo no	AaaAaAaaAaa
d	br̥hád vadema, vidáthe suvīrāḥ //	aAaaaaAaaAa]

7. CONCLUSIONS.

This short survey is a first attempt to analyze and classify the ways in which the poets of the Ṛgveda made use of the accentual contour. Even on the basis of a limited corpus (all examples are taken from the second Maṇḍala, which is the shortest Maṇḍala in the RV) it can satisfactorily be shown that the poets used the accentual contour on a large scale: as a device for linking pādas, hemistichs and stanzas, as a device for emphasizing various repetitions and the refrain, as rhyme, as an anagram, etc. We may thus conclude that this “play” on accents was an essential element of the poetical technique of the Vedic bards.

Accentual sequences can further provide important information for metrical problems. For instance, if we cannot choose between two metrical solutions, repetition of a melody can serve as an argument in favour of one of the alternatives. It is possible that sometimes the metrical requirements became subordinate to an accentual device, which may explain several instances of metrical “roughness”. We have also seen that investigation of accentual patterns may throw new light on the precise realization of accents in the Vedic times: the problem of the independent svarita in the RV may be solved in this way.

533

In the future it will be interesting to look at the accentual patterns in the Greek poetical tradition. If it appears that the Greek poets used the accentual contour as a poetical device (and from a few samples I took from Homer this indeed seems likely), further investigation may open up a new page in the study of Proto-Indo-European poetics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

534

- Elizarenkova, T.Ja. – Toporov, V.N. 1979: Drevneindijskaja poetika i ee indoevropejskie istoki, *Literatura i kul'tura drevnej i srednevekovoj Indii*, Moscow, 36-88.
- Howard, W. 1986: *Veda Recitation in Vārāṇasī*. Delhi.
- Gonda, J. 1959: *Stylistic Repetition in the Veda*. Amsterdam.
- Kuiper, F.B.J. 1974: ví dayate and vidátha-. *Indologica Taurinensia* 2, 121-132.
- Oldenberg, H. *Noten: Ṛgveda: Textkritische und exegetische Noten*. 2 vols. Berlin, 1909-1912.
- Renou, L. *EVP: Études védiques et pāṇiníennes*, 17 vols. Paris, 1955-1969.
- RV: *Die Hymnen des Rigveda*, herausg. von Th. Aufrecht. Bonn, 1877.
- Seebold, E. 1972: *Das System der indogermanischen Halbvokale*. Heidelberg.
- Starobinski, J. 1971: *Les mots sous les mots. Les anagrammes de Ferdinand de Saussure*. Paris.
- Toporov, V.N. 1965: K opisaniu nekotoryx struktur, xarakterizujuščix preimuščestvenno nizšie urovni, v nekotoryx poetičeskix tekstax, *Trudy po znakovym sistemam II*, Tartu, 306-319.
- Toporov, V.N. 1981: Die Ursprünge der indoeuropäischen Poetik, *Poetica* 13, 189-251.