



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Book Review : K. Kupfer, Die Demonstrativpronomina im Rigveda

Kulikov, L.I.

Citation

Kulikov, L. I. (2005). Book Review : K. Kupfer, Die Demonstrativpronomina im Rigveda. *Kratylos*, 50, 83-89.
Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16511>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

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

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16511>

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

Sonderdruck aus

KRATYLOS

KRITISCHES BERICHTS-
UND REZENSIONSORGAN
FÜR INDOGERMANISCHE
UND ALLGEMEINE
SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

JAHRGANG 50

2005

DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG · WIESBADEN

Kupfer, Katharina: Die Demonstrativpronomina im Rigveda. Frankfurt am Main usw., Peter Lang, 2002, 8° [xx], 403 S. (Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe 21: Linguistik, 244.) Brosch. 60,30€.

The book under review is an extended version of K.'s 2000 PhD dissertation. It offers a complete description of the system of demonstrative pronouns attested in the oldest Vedic text, the Rigveda (RV). The book consists of seven chapters of very unequal length, numbered from 0 to 6. Within the headers, the author uses a different (and, in some respects, a simpler) division of the book: "Einleitung – Literaturbericht" (= Ch. 0), "Grammatiktheoretischer Teil – Allgemeinsprachlich" (= Ch. 1), "Semasiologischer Teil", which might also be called 'From form to function' (= Ch.s 2, 3 and 5), and "Onomasiologischer Teil", or 'From function to form' (= Ch. 4).

The introductory Ch. 0, "Einleitung" (1–6), delimits the topic and scope of the study and offers a short survey of the literature dealing with demonstrative pronouns in a general perspective and in Vedic.

Ch. 1, "Beschreibungsmodell" (7–38), outlines the theoretical framework used and gives the definitions of the main linguistic concepts, such

as deixis,¹ topic, definite, generic, etc. K. also dwells on several theoretical issues, such as types of definiteness (generic, semantic, contextual, etc.), textual cohesion vs. coherence, etc. Most definitions are given in the form of quotations from Himmelmann 1997, Hawkins 1978 and some other studies on deixis, to which K. refers the reader for details and discussion. The main shortcoming of the chapter is that some definitions are not accompanied by illustrative examples, and, where present, illustrations are mostly taken from German and English; the first Vedic example appears at the end of the chapter, on p. 30. It would be appropriate to start immediately with illustrations from the RV or, at least, to provide exact references to the following parts of the book, indicating how relevant the theoretical concepts in question are for the Vedic material. This would undoubtedly help the reader to gain a firm footing within the whirlpool of the numerous definitions which form the main content of this chapter.

There are also a few (minor) inconsistencies in the terminological usage which further complicate the cross-reference between the theoretical part and the lexicographic description of the individual pronouns in the following chapters. Thus, the substantive usage of demonstrative pronouns is first introduced, in accordance with the traditional terminology, as “substantivische Verwendung” (31), and, immediately after that, K. explains that “[i]n der vorliegenden Arbeit wird statt dessen von “pronominaler” Verwendung gesprochen” (31⁴⁷). However, in individual lemmata this type of usage is called ‘independent’ (“selbständige Verwendung”; e.g., 48, 52, 66, etc.).

The last section of the chapter deals with the transfer of demonstrative pronouns to other word classes, such as adverbs, particles, conjunctions (connectors) and (definite) articles. Distinguishing between demonstrative pronouns and definite articles, K. essentially follows Himmelmann’s (1997: 41) criterion: definite articles do not ‘make’ noun phrases definite but characterize them as such, whereas demonstrative pronouns can make an expression definite (p. 35). Here, again, illustrative material from the RV would be appropriate.

Ch. 2, “Darstellung der Demonstrativpronomina im RV aus semasiologischer Sicht“, the lengthiest in the book (39–260), offers a description of the usages of demonstrative pronouns in the RV. It consists of eleven lemmata, or lexical entries: *a-/i-*, *ena-* (the first two are considered one single lexical item with a suppletive paradigm), *adás*, *avá-*, *idám*, *īm*, *etád*, *tád*, *tyád*, *simá-* and *sīm*. Each lemma opens with the formal characteristic of the pronoun under discussion, which includes the attested paradigm and the

¹ K. defines deixis as “[e]in sprachliches Ausdrucksmittel der Referenz” (7), which is quite different from standard definitions. Normally, deixis is understood not as a ‘means of expression of the reference’ (such a definition covers, in fact, a much larger area and, in any case, is too vague), but as a particular way in which the interpretation of certain linguistic expressions (called ‘deictic’) is determined by the parameters of speech situation; see, for instance, Levinson 1994.

list of the features peculiar to the given lexeme and serving as criteria for identifying it as a pronoun. The morphological part is followed by a detailed discussion of morphosyntactic types of usages of the pronoun under consideration (attributive, predicative, independent; main syntactic functions; transfers to other word classes) and a description of its semantics (types of deictic usages: spatial deixis, temporal deixis, etc.) and pragmatics. A special sub-section deals with difficult and problematic attestations of the pronoun in question. The lemmata are concluded with short summaries. Such a laudably uniform scheme of presentation is one of the major assets of the book and can serve as a model for further studies in the field of lexicographical description of grammatical lexemes.

On the basis of the evidence from the RV, K. uncovers the main features relevant both for a synchronic description of the pronominal system of the RV and for a study of the main trends in its development. I will confine myself to a few examples from K.’s lemmata.

Thus, among the features of the pronoun represented by the forms built on the pronominal stem *ena-* (enclitic forms of *idám*), she notices the following: it is mainly employed in the substantive (= independent) usage, while the adjective (attributive) usages first appear in late hymns; it is typically employed anaphorically and does not occur in spatial deictic usages. At the end of this lemma K. discusses the difficult passage RV 8.6.19 (*imás ta indra pṛśnayo ghytám duhata āśīram énáṃ ṛtásya pipyúṣīḥ*), translated by her as ‘Diese scheckigen (sc. Kühe) milchen dir, Indra, Butterschmalz, warme Sauermilch, da (sie) von der (sc. S a u e r m i l c h) der Weltordnung strotzen’ (73–74).²

² Unfortunately, the analysis of the passage is incomplete in some respects and leaves several problems untouched. First, albeit quoting Oldenberg’s (1907: 830) tentative emendation ⁺*dhénām* for *énām*, K. does not mention Oldenberg’s later very detailed discussion of this passage in his *Noten* (1912: 82–83), where he withdrew his earlier emendation and suggested another (adverb ⁺*énā(m)*). Second, the construction where the pronoun is dominated by a genitive (*ṛtásya*) appears somewhat suspicious for Vedic syntax.

In my view, the genitive *ṛtásya* is syntactically connected with the participle *pipyúṣīḥ* (which refers to cows), rather than with *énām*. This genitive construction means thus ‘the swelling [cows] of Order; the [cows] of Order which have swollen’ and has a number of parallels in the RV, cf. 1.73.6 *ṛtásya dhenávo* ‘milk cows of Order’, 1.84.16 *gā ṛtásya* ‘cows of Order’ and 1.144.2 *abbīm ṛtásya dohānā anūṣata* ‘the [cows] of Order giving milk roared at him’. Note that in the last passage, as in 8.6.19, the genitive *ṛtásya* is syntactically connected with the participle, *dohānā*, which further increases the syntactic similarity between RV 8.6.19 and 1.144.2. As correctly suggested both by earlier translators and by K., *énām* functions as a content accusative (Inhaltsakkusativ); for this construction with the verb *pī/payī* ‘swell in/with smth.’, see, in particular, Kümmel 2000: 299. It remains to establish to which feminine noun *énām* might refer. Apart from *āśīr-* ‘mixture, (sour) milk’, another possible candidate is *svadhā-*, as RV 2.35.7 suggests, where this noun appears in the content accusative construction with *pī/payī*: *sudúghā... dhenūḥ svadhām pīpāya* ‘the well-milking milch cow has swollen with vital power’. The passage in question can thus be tentatively translated as ‘these speckled ones give you, o Indra, ghee, warm sour milk, the [milch cows] of Order swelling / having swollen with it (sc. *āśīr-* ‘mixture, milk’ or *svadhā-* ‘vital power’(?)).

The pronoun *adās* commonly has a distant deictic meaning, referring to an object outside the sphere controlled by the speaker (Germ. *jener*). It often refers to the heavens (*div-*) but cannot be used to address a deity; anaphoric and cataphoric usages are impossible.

The pronominal stem *avā-*, attested only in the form *avóh*, occurs in the RV only twice, at 6.67.11 and 7.67.4 (10.132.5 does not belong here, as K. argues). K. convincingly demonstrates that, in spite of the scarcity of attestations, this pronoun represents a separate lexical unit and cannot be included into the system of *idám*, contra Klein 1977.

In the lemma *idám*, K. demonstrates that the attributive occurrences represent the unmarked usage of this pronoun, typically oriented towards the speaker (*hic*-deixis), and pays special attention to the adverbial usage of the accusative *idám*. Albeit not calling in question the etymological relationship between the enclitic forms such as *asya*, *asmai*, etc. and the accented *ásya*, *ásmāi*, etc., K. treats them as belonging to synchronically distinct paradigms (58, 120).

A separate lemma deals with the enclitic pronoun *im* (*ī*), mainly employed anaphorically and for putting emphasis on the preceding word. The author points out that both forms, *im* and *ī* (the latter appears only after the preceding *m*), occur almost exclusively (“fast ausschließlich”) in the accusative usages (133). As far as I can judge from the text of the lemma and from the paradigm on p. 128, the only exception is the occurrence of *ī* in RV 1.103.1 *tāt ta indriyām paramām parācāir ābhārayanta kavāyah purédām | kṣamédām anyād divy anyād asya sām ī pṛcyate samanēva ketūh*, which K. translates as ‘[d]as (besitzt) du als höchstes indrisches (Wesen) in weiter Ferne. (Die) Weisen bestätigen dieses (sc. Wesen) hier seit alters. Auf (der) Erde ist dieses eine (hier), im Himmel sein anderes. Zusammengemischt wird es wie (ein) Licht zu einem ganzen (sc. brennenden Licht).’ (134) Unfortunately, K. leaves the syntax of this exceptional attestation without comment. In particular, it would be in order to discuss the possibility of an accusative interpretation, thus eliminating the only (and therefore quite suspicious) nominative occurrence from the paradigm of *im/ī*. In my view, *ī* can represent here an accusative of content/result, retained in the intransitive (passive?) construction. Cf., for instance, the accusatives constructed with the passive *duhyate* ‘is milked’ in RV 9.74.4 ... *nābho duhyate ghr̥tām páyah* ‘the cloud is milked, [yielding] ghee [and] milk’ (see Kulikov 2001: 91 for a discussion). Thus, the last *pāda* (*sām ī pṛcyate* ...) can be tentatively translated as ‘[this = the two aspects, the earthen and the heavenly ones] is mixed to it (= is mixed, [yielding] it)’, where *ī* ‘it’ seems to refer to *indriyām paramām* ‘the highest [nature] of Indra’.

In the lemma *tād*, after a lengthy discussion of the usage of this pronoun in the function of a connector (188–192), K. denies the existence of a special *sā*-figé construction in the RV, thus adopting the analysis by H. H. Hock (1997).

The short Ch. 3, “Zusammenfassung des semasiologischen Teils” (261–270), should in fact be included into Ch. 2 as its general summary. Here K. undertakes a systematic comparison of the pronouns under study in terms of the main descriptive parameters: types of syntactic usage (independent/attributive); types of deixis (distant/close); the existence of anaphoric and/or cataphoric usages; etc.

While in Ch. 2 the Vedic data are presented in the form of individual lemmata, i.e. from form to function, in Ch. 4, “Darstellung der Demonstrativpronomina im RV aus onomasiologischer Sicht” (271–312), the author changes the perspective of presentation to the opposite and dwells upon the issue of how the main deictic meanings can be rendered by means of Vedic pronouns. The Chapter consists of two main sections. Section 4.01 deals with the introductory deictic meanings (“Einführende Darstellungsweisen”), which include, in particular, speech act deixis and spatial deixis. These meanings are expressed, foremost, by *adās* (‘jenes’) and *idám* (‘dieses’). Thus, K. demonstrates that pronouns which can refer to the Speaker include *idám*, *a-/i-*, *etád* and *tád*; an object equally distant from the Speaker and Hearer is normally referred to by *adās* (278); etc. The section concludes with a short discussion of several minor types, such as textual deixis (“Texteigendeixis”), i.e. reference to the speech being pronounced (286 f.). This usage (which is very important in the context of the Vedic ritual) is attested for *idám* (cf. RV 1.26.10 *idám vácah* ‘this speech’), *etád* (cf. RV 7.19.10 *eté stómā[h]* ‘these recitations, praises’) and *tád* (cf. RV 2.17.1 *tád návyam* ‘this new [song]’).

The second Section, 4.02, deals with the types of deixis which do not introduce new objects but refer to something regarded as known to the Hearer or inferable from basic knowledge (“Aktivierende Darstellungsweisen”). Here belong, in particular, generic and contextual definiteness, as well as the usages called by K. ‘implicit deixis’, i.e. anaphora, particularly common for *a-/i-*, *ena* and *sīm*.

In Ch. 5, “Darstellung der Demonstrativpronomina im RV aus historisch-vergleichender Sicht” (313–377), the author returns to the ‘semasiological’ (= from form to function) perspective and concentrates on the diachronic aspects of the demonstrative pronouns. The short introductory section 5.01 offers a general survey of the deictic lexemes in the pre-Rigvedic period (i.e. reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European). In fact, the discussion of evidence outside Vedic is limited to Old Iranian (which furnishes of course the richest parallels to the forms attested in the RV).

Section 5.02, dealing with individual pronouns, consists of four sub-sections, corresponding to the four Indo-European (Indo-Iranian) roots reflected in the RVic deictic words. These are **i-*, **sīm* and **semH-*, **ta-*, and **ov-*. All these roots are represented in Indo-Iranian by more than one lexeme. For each item, K. suggests possible function(s) which can be reconstructed for Proto-Indo-Iranian on the basis of evidence from Vedic, Avestan and Old Persian. Thus, **i-* is reflected in 1) Ved. *im/ī* and Av. *ī*, *ī̄*; 2) Ved. *id*, Old Av. *ī̄*, Late Av. *ī̄* and Old Persian *naīy* < **na id*; 3) Ved. *idám*, *a-/i-* (enclitic stem of *idám*), Av. *aiiōm*, *imat* etc. and Old Persian *iyam*, *ima* etc.; and 4) Ved. *ena-*. The reflexes of the root **ov-* are found in two items, the pronoun *adās* (where *-d-* may have been introduced in analogy with *idám*, according to Tedesco’s suggestion) and the isolated form *avóh*.

Section 5.03 summarizes the features of the Proto-Indo-Iranian reconstructed pronouns: their inflection, stem alternation, accentuation, syntax, semantics and pragmatics (types of deixis), as well as possible traces of other Indo-Iranian (Indo-European) pronominal morphemes.

The book concludes with a bibliography and index of the RVic passages quoted. Quite annoying is the lack of subject index, which would be helpful for a quick orientation within the complex terminological system. An index of discussed forms would be useful, too.

K.'s monograph is an excellent presentation of the system of demonstrative pronouns of the RV, their syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Aside from the somewhat chaotically written theoretical part (Ch. 1), the main body of the book ("Semasiologischer Teil" and "Onomasiologischer Teil") is well-organized, which makes orientation in the material quite easy. It conveniently summarizes the results of earlier studies on this lexical class, discusses a number of problematic forms and passages from the RV and offers some new interesting solutions for several old problems. The book also contains a number of important corrigenda to some standard works on Vedic, such as the RVic concordance by Lubotsky (1997). Thus, on p. 166, K. lists occurrences of the feminine pronominal form *sā́* which are taken by Lubotsky (1997: 1428 ff.) as nom.sg.m. forms; on p. 175–177, K. argues that the isolated form *sásmin* should not be included into the paradigm of *sá-/tá-* (contra Lubotsky 1997: 1446), but belongs to *samá-* 'same', thus adopting K. Hoffmann's analysis *sásmin* ← **samásmin*.

The book is highly recommended for Sanskritists, Indo-Europeanists, as well as for all those interested in the linguistic pragmatics and general theory of deictic pronouns.

References

- Hawkins, John A. 1978. Definiteness and indefiniteness. A study in reference and grammaticality prediction. London: Humanities Press.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 1997. Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase. Zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Hock, Hans H. 1997. Nexus and 'extraclausality' in Vedic, or 'sa-figé' all over again: A historical (re)examination. In: H. H. Hock (ed.), Historical, Indo-European, and lexicographical studies: a Festschrift for Ladislav Zgusta on the occasion of his 70th birthday, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 49–78.
- Klein, Jared S. 1977. The Indo-Iranian prehistory of the Sanskrit *asáu/amú* pronoun. JIES 5: 161–176.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2001. The Vedic *-ya-* presents. PhD thesis. Leiden University.
- Kümmel, Martin. 2000. Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1994. Deixis. In: R. E. Asher et al. (eds.), The Encyclopedia of language and linguistics. Vol. 2. Oxford etc.: Pergamon Press, 853–857.

- Lubotsky, Alexander M. 1997. A Ṛgvedic word concordance. 2 parts. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1907. Vedische Untersuchungen. 22. *sá* und *sáb* im Ṛgveda. ZDMG 61: 833–835.
- . 1912. Ṛgveda. Textkritische und exegetische Noten. Bd. 2. Siebentes bis zehntes Buch. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.

Leiden University
Faculty of Arts, Department of Comparative Linguistics (VTW)
PO Box 9515

NL-2300 RA Leiden

Leonid Kulikov