



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

**Review of: Agnes Korn, Metrik und metrische Techniken im Rgveda.  
Streckformen in Trimester-Versen, Graz**

Lubotsky, A.M.

**Citation**

Lubotsky, A. M. (2004). Review of: Agnes Korn, Metrik und metrische Techniken im Rgveda. Streckformen in Trimester-Versen, Graz. *Kratylos*, 49, 177-181. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16407>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16407>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Korn, Agnes: *Metrik und metrische Techniken im Ṛgveda. Streckformen in Trimeter-Versen*. Graz, Leykam Verlag, 1998, 8°, 204 S. (Arbeiten aus der Abteilung „Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft“ Graz, 12.) Brosch. 18,02 €.

The book is based on a Master’s thesis, defended in 1995 at the University of Vienna. The starting point for the study was an observation by J. Schindler that the poets of the Ṛgveda (RV) sometimes replace adjectives and compounds in *-a-* by *-ya-* in order to accommodate them to the cadence of an “even” metre (i.e. containing 8-syllabic or 12-syllabic lines).

The book starts with an overview of Vedic and Indo-European metrics (Ch. 1, “Forschungsgeschichte zur Metrik”), followed by the main body of the text (Ch. 2, “Streckformen im Ṛgveda”), where the author discusses various strategies used by the poets of the RV for extending the formulas: 2.2 “Das Suffix *-ya-*”, 2.3 “Andere Suffixe zur Versverlängerung” (*-in-*, *-i-*, *-ka-*, *-vant-/mant-*), 2.4 “Die Gesetze von Lindeman und Sievers zur Versvariation”, 2.5 “Die 2. Plural Aktiv”. The book ends with an appendix on the various derivative compounds in the RV, a bibliography, a list of abbreviations and a word index.

178

The evidence, presented by K. in favor of the main thesis of the book, viz. the “stretching” of the triṣṭubh cadences, is of uneven value. The best case is the extension of adjectives and (bahuvrīhi) compounds by a suffix, especially by the suffix *-ya-*. K. uses three criteria in order to pinpoint the long form as being due to stretching: 1) the long form has essentially the same meaning as the short one, 2) the long form is only used in the cadence of the even metres, and 3) the long form does not occur outside the RV and is thus most probably artificial. The forms, which match all these criteria, are, for instance: *yáviṣṭh(y)a-* ‘the youngest’ (vs. *yáviṣṭha-* ‘id.’), which in all its 15 occurrences stands in the cadence of an 8-syllabic or 12-syllabic line, and *suháṣṭ(y)a-* ‘with beautiful hands’ (vs. *suháṣta-* ‘id.’), which 3 times occurs in such a cadence.

Interestingly enough, there are no formulas which are transposed from the triṣṭubh into an even metre. The best candidate is 10.1.7c *prá yāh(y) áchośató yaviṣṭha-* and 10.2.1a *piprīhī devāṃ uśató yaviṣṭha* vs. 8.60.4a *ádrogham ā vahośató yaviṣṭh(y)a*, but in all these cases, *uśatáh* does not form a syntagm with *yáviṣṭh(y)a-*, being the object of the preceding verb. Therefore, it is likely that the poets did not really stretch the lines or formulas, but rather made use of the parallelism of the adjective suffixes *-a-* and *-ya-* in order to create nonce forms, which are longer by one syllable and suit the cadence of the even metres. K. further makes clear that this strategy was also known to the poets of the Avesta (e.g. *a-x<sup>v</sup>afniia-* ‘sleepless’ vs. *a-x<sup>v</sup>afna-*) and is thus inherited at least from the Indo-Iranian period. Since Greek has pairs like *δοχμός* and *δόχμιος* ‘aslant’ (cf. p. 82), the parallelism of the suffixes seems to be of Indo-European date, and the poets could make use of it at any time.

Among the other suffixes, the clearest are *-in-* and *-vant-/mant-*, which sometimes are pleonastically added to adjectives in order to make them longer by one syllable (e.g. *matsaríntama-* ‘most intoxicating’, *matsarávant-* ‘intoxicating’ vs. *matsará-* ‘id.’). Here, too, there are no formulas involved. Recently, R. Schmitt (1997) argued that the suffix *-aya-* was also used by the poets of the RV for this purpose. In this article, which was not yet available to K., Schmitt shows that *avyáya-/ávyaya-* ‘made of sheep’s wool’ generally stands in the cadence of the even metres and seems to be an extended variant of *ávya-* ‘id.’ (even though Gr. *οἶεος* is its exact counterpart). Here we do have a formula: (*ádhi*) *sāno ávye* (8× in a triṣṭubh cadence at the end of Book 9) vs. *ádhi sāno avyáye* (in a jagatī cadence at 9.86.3c).

The yield from examining the cases of Lindeman's Law is very meagre. K. has only found three possible examples of stretching, and all of them are doubtful (also in her view) because of wrong cadences. Consider, for instance, 8.36.2a *práva stotāram maghavann áva t<sub>(u)</sub>vám*. The metre of the hymn is 12-8-4 / 8-12-4-8 (cf. Oldenberg 1888: 114; K.'s metrical analysis must be corrected). Of course, a 12-syllable line would be preferable, but then the cadence is wrong. In the same hymn we also find 8.36.4a *janitā divó janitā pṛthiv<sub>(i)</sub>yāḥ*, which shows the same problem. We have the choice between assuming triṣṭubh lines with correct cadences or jagatī lines with wrong cadences. A somewhat similar case is 8.70.5b *śatām bhūmīr utá s<sub>(i)</sub>yúḥ*. Here I would definitely opt for a heptasyllabic line because of equally heptasyllabic 8.70.7a *ná sīm ádeva āpad* in the same hymn. The last passage is 5.86.5a *tā vṛdhántāv ánu d<sub>(i)</sub>yún* (the unresolved *ánu dyún* occurs 16 times in triṣṭubh lines).

179

On the other hand, there are ten good examples of unresolved monosyllables after a heavy syllable in the cadence of triṣṭubh verses (given by K. on p. 155), where we can assume shortening of the jagatī-lines, a possibility which, surprisingly enough, is never mentioned in the book. This is even more clear in forms showing the reflex of Sievers' Law. Unlike Lindeman forms, they often occur in the cadence. K. discusses only a few endings after a heavy syllable, viz. the medial endings *-dhve*, *-dhvam*, *-dhvai*, *-sva* and the nominal endings *-bhyah*, *-bhyām*. The vast majority of the forms in the cadence are resolved, in accordance with our expectations: 52 forms in the cadence of 12-syll. verses and 63 in the cadence of 8-syll. verses (vs. 19 unresolved forms in the cadence of 11-syll. verses and 9 in trochaic gāyatrī). It is then *a priori* much more probable that we are here dealing with secondary shortening of 12-syllabic lines.<sup>1</sup> This is further confirmed by the older distribution of the resolved forms among the books and by the formulas. I just cite one example, the 2pl. aor. middle *áyudhvam*. The form occurs 6 times in the hymns to the Maruts, always in the cadence, and is part of a formula, cf.

1.39.6a	<i>úpo rátheṣu pṛṣatīr ayudh<sub>(u)</sub>vam</i>	J (? , 6c is triṣṭubh)
1.64.7d	<i>yád ārunīṣu táviṣīr ayudh<sub>(u)</sub>vam</i>	J
1.85.4d	<i>vṛṣavratāsaḥ pṛṣatīr ayudh<sub>(u)</sub>vam</i>	J
1.85.5a	<i>prá yád rátheṣu pṛṣatīr ayudhvam</i>	T
5.55.6a	<i>yád áśvān dhūrṣū pṛṣatīr ayudh<sub>(u)</sub>vam</i>	J
5.57.3d	<i>śubhé yád ugrāḥ pṛṣatīr ayudh<sub>(u)</sub>vam</i>	J

There can be little doubt that the original formula was composed in jagatī (note that the jagatī passages contain two occurrences in Book 5). The only exception is 1.84.5a, which is the result of a metrical play by the poet. This hymn is written in jagatī, and only the middle stanza 5 is in triṣṭubh<sup>2</sup>. The change of metre is introduced by line 5a, which represents a variation of the preceding one (1.85.4d) and contains the same formula, but this time presumably in triṣṭubh.

Also as far as the 2pl. active endings in *-t(h)a* (+ *na*) are concerned, it is far from clear that we are dealing with stretching. Consider the following, rather extreme example:

5.55.9b	<i>-asmábhyam śárma bahulám ví yantana ≈</i>
	6.51.5d <i>asmábhyam śárma bahulám ví yanta</i>
5.55.9c	<i>ádhi stotrásya sakh<sub>y</sub>ásya gātana ≈</i>
	10.78.8c <i>ádhi stotrásya sakh<sub>y</sub>ásya gāta.</i>

<sup>1</sup>K., however, assumes stretching here: "Die SIEVERS-Flexionsformen konnten variabel mit ein- oder zweisilbigem Suffix eingesetzt werden, um Kadenzen aus Triṣṭubh-Versen für Jagatīkadenzen zu verwenden" (p. 170).

<sup>2</sup>The final stanza 12, which is a *dānastuti*, is in triṣṭubh too, but the *dānastutis* are often written in a different metre.

For K., this and similar passages with *-na* forms are due to stretching of the original *triṣṭubh* verses, but the morphology points in the opposite direction. If we look at the 2pl. forms of the *-nu*-presents (with secondary endings), we find a remarkable distribution (the forms are taken from Macdonell 1910: 345ff.):

impf./inj.:	<i>ṛṇutá, akṛṇuta/akṛṇota</i> <i>akṛṇotana</i>	
imperative:	<i>ūrṇuta, kṛṇutá/kṛṇóta, tṛṇuta, dhūnuta, śṛṇutá/śṛṇota, sunutá/sunóta, hinuta</i> (AV) / <i>hinóta, tanota</i> (AV, TS) <i>kṛṇótana, śṛṇotana, sunótana, hinotana</i>	180

The forms in *-tana* all have full grade of the suffix, while the forms without *-na* have full grade only when there is a parallel variant in *-tana* (the only exception is late *tanota*). Also elsewhere, forms in *-tana* almost always have full grade in the stem<sup>3</sup>, with a notable exception of class IX pres. impv. (*punītána, pṛṇītana, śṛṇītana*) and perf. impv. (*jujuṣṭana, mamattána, vavṛttana*).<sup>4</sup> Avestan shows that full grade in these 2pl. forms is likely to be old, cf. GAv. pres. inj. *mraotā, dābānaotā*, LAV. pres. impv. *nisrinaota, upa.śaēta*, GAv. aor. impv. *cauištā, dātā, sraotā*; zero-grade is only found in GAv. inj. *uštā* and LAV. impv. *dasta*. We must most probably reconstruct full grade in 2pl., at least for Proto-Indo-Iranian<sup>5</sup>, and assume that zero-grades are secondary.

The distribution of full and zero-grades in Sanskrit *-tana* forms is clearly of metrical origin. A possible scenario is the following. When zero-grade was, for instance, introduced into *sunóta(na)*, the long form *sunótana* resisted the analogical change, because *ṣsunutana* with its four consecutive short syllables would have been metrically inconvenient<sup>6</sup>. Later, the system *sunutá / sunótana* led to creation of a secondary *sunóta*. The introduction of zero-grade in imperatives of class IX presents and perfects did not create any problems, however, because the syllable preceding *-tana* was long.

If this scenario is correct, the 2pl. forms in *-ta* with full grade (and exactly these forms often appear in the cadence of *triṣṭubh* lines) are dependent on the *-tana* forms. Therefore, it seems more likely to me that at least in case of these forms, we are dealing with shortening, rather than with stretching.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>3</sup>Since, to my knowledge, the *-tana* forms have never been presented together (those in *-thana* show no anomalies), I here give a complete list of the RV *-tana* forms. The list is based on Macdonell 1910 and Lubotsky 1997a (impv. is unmarked):

class I: *bhajatana*; class II: *attana, itana/étana, hantana, bravītana, yātana, śāstana*; impf. *ābravītana, āyātana, āsastana, āitana*; opt. *syātana*; class III: *jigātana, juhótana, dadātana, didiṣṭana, dhattana/dádhātana, pīpartana, yuyótana, vivaktana*; impf. *ajahātana, ādattana*; class IV: *nahyatana*; class V: *kṛṇótana, śṛṇotana, sunótana, hinotana*, impf. *akṛṇotana*, class VI: opt. *tiretana*; class VII: *anaktana, pinaṣṭana*; class IX: *punītana, pṛṇītana, śṛṇītana* (metrically *śṛṇītana*);

Root-aor.: *kártana, gántana, gātana, citana, dhātana/dhetana, pātana* (AV), *bhūtana, yantana, sotana*; aor. *abhūtana, áhetana*, inj. *bhūtana*; Red. aor.: *acucyavītana*; a-aor.: *sadatanā*; iṣ-aor.: *aviṣṭana, rániṣṭana, śnathīṣṭana, vadhiṣṭana*;

Perfect: *jujuṣṭana, mamattána, vavṛttana*; ppf. *ajabhartana, ajagantana*; inj. *bibhītana*.

<sup>4</sup>But once *punātā* (9.104.3a)!

<sup>5</sup>Hoffmann (1952: 129), followed by Insler (1972: 551), assumed that full grade in 2pl. is original in the aorist. This view, given without any adstruction, is presumably based on the full grade in the indicative (*ákarma, ákarta*).

<sup>6</sup>This must also be the reason why there is only one form in *-tana* from class I presents, viz. the hapax *bhajatana* (with metrical lengthening), used in the break. The same is true for the unique a-aor. impv. *sadatanā*.

<sup>7</sup>The best case of formula stretching has been suggested to me by Daniel Baum: the formula *paramé vyòman* ‘at the highest heaven’ occurs 12 times in the cadence of the *triṣṭubh* verses and is stretched 5 times to *paramé vyòmani* in order to make it fit into the cadence of a jagatī line.

At the end of this review I would like to draw the reader's attention to K.'s important observations on the chronology of Lindeman's Law. Although the chronology is not her primary concern, she presents several arguments which point to a late date of this Law: 181

(1). "Ein weiterer Fall könnte *smád* "zugleich" sein, dessen zweisilbige Variante wohl in *sumád* "dass." vorliegt (...). Der Vokal *-u-* spräche dabei für indoiranische Wirkung von LINDEMANS Gesetz, denn als alte Variante hätte †*samad* entstehen müssen (Hinweis WERBA)" (p. 128, fn. 238). I think that "indoiranisch" here is a misprint for "indoarisch".

(2). "*tú-/tvá-* ist erst sekundär hier eingeordnet worden: Ursprünglich hieß der Nominativ nur *t<sub>u</sub>vám* < \**tuHam* und der Akkusativ nur *tvám* < \**t<sub>u</sub>a-am*" (p. 128, fn. 239). In a recent article (Lubotsky 1997b: 150f.), I have also come to the conclusion that, in spite of the different etymological origin of these two forms, they show very similar metrical behaviour<sup>8</sup>. This fact points to the chronology: 1. \**-u(u)á-* > *-vá-*; 2. Lindeman's Law.

(3). "Auch *jyók* ist kein alter Fall von LINDEMAN, da es einsilbiges \**dyók* mit der Lautentwicklung *dy* > *jy* (cf. √*dyut/jyot*) > *mī. j* voraussetzt" (p. 129, fn. 242). For the development *dy* > *jy* see Aan de Wiel 2000.

These three pieces of evidence suggest that Lindeman's Law is not of Indo-European date, as is usually assumed, but rather a recent extension of Sievers' Law in Vedic. As it is put by Schindler (1977: 64), Lindeman's Law "ist lediglich die Satzsandhiversion von Sievers".

#### References

- Aan de Wiel, C. 2000: *dy* > *jy*, oder Prākritismus im Rīgveda? Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik, edd. B. Forssman, R. Plath. Wiesbaden, 535-542.
- Hoffmann, K. 1952: Zur vedischen Verbalflexion. MSS 2, 121-137.
- Insler, St. 1972: Some irregular Vedic imperatives. Lg 48, 551-565.
- Lubotsky, A. 1997a: A R̥gvedic Word Concordance. 2 Vols. New Haven.
- Lubotsky, A. 1997b: The Indo-Iranian reflexes of PIE \**CRHUV*. Sound Law and Analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S.P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday (A. Lubotsky, ed.). Amsterdam - Atlanta, 139-154.
- Macdonell, A.A. 1910: *Vedic grammar*. Strassburg.
- Oldenberg, H. 1888: Die Hymnen des Rīgveda. Band I: Metrische und textgeschichtliche Prolegomena. Berlin.
- Schindler, J. 1977: Notizen zum Sieversschen Gesetz. Sprache 23, 56-65.
- Schmitt, R. 1997: Vedisch *avya-*, *avyáya-*, *avyaya-* "vom Schafe herrührend", Sound Law and Analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S.P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday (A. Lubotsky, ed.). Amsterdam - Atlanta, 285-292.

Universiteit Leiden  
 Faculteit der Letteren  
 Postbus 9515  
 NL-2300 RA Leiden

Alexander Lubotsky

<sup>8</sup>K.'s figures concerning the metrical treatment of *tvám* in fn. 239 must be corrected, cf. the table in Lubotsky 1997b: 150.