

The Functions of Vedic *cid*, *íd*, *īm*, *ī* and *sīm*

Pascal Coenen

Inaugural-Dissertation

zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität zu

Köln im Fach

Historisch-vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft

Mai 2024

Bei der vorliegenden Arbeit handelt es sich um die überarbeitete Version meiner Dissertation im Fach Historisch-vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft, die am 09.02.2021 an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität zu Köln eingereicht und am 06.05.2021 erfolgreich verteidigt wurde.

Table of contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Focus particles, information structure and related terms	4
3	Corpus and methodology	14
4	The employment of <i>cid</i> in the Rigveda	21
4.1	The functions of <i>cid</i> as an additive particle	23
4.2	Multiple occurrences of <i>cid</i> and its use as a discourse marker	46
4.3	<i>cid</i> in lexicalized collocations	64
4.3.1	Interrogative proform + <i>cid</i>	65
4.3.2	<i>nū́</i> ‘now’ + <i>cid</i>	81
4.4	<i>cid</i> with a totalizing function	93
4.4.1	Contexts in which <i>cid</i> has a totalizing function	94
4.4.2	Totalizing <i>cid</i> and universal quantification	104
4.5	<i>cid</i> as a degree modifier	112
4.6	<i>cid</i> as a marker of concessivity	123
4.6.1	Concessives and related constructions	123
4.6.2	<i>cid</i> in concessive conditional clauses	126
4.6.3	<i>cid</i> and secondary predicates	156
4.7	<i>cid</i> as a particularizer	169
4.8	Shared functions of <i>cid</i> and <i>íd</i>	173
4.9	<i>cid</i> as a comparative particle ‘like’	194
4.10	The syntactic behavior of <i>cid</i>	202
4.11	Summary	219
5	The employment of <i>íd</i> in the Rigveda	223
5.1	<i>íd</i> as an exclusive particle	226
5.2	<i>íd</i> as an identifier	242
5.3	Specificatory and intensificatory <i>íd</i>	251
5.4	<i>íd</i> after quantifying expressions	263
5.4.1	<i>íd</i> after universal quantifiers and numerals	263
5.4.2	<i>íd</i> after <i>āmreḍitas</i>	275
5.5	<i>íd</i> as an intensifier	285
5.6	<i>íd</i> as an additive particle and a particularizer	292
5.6.1	<i>íd</i> as an additive particle	293

5.6.2	<i>íd</i> as a particularizer	299
5.7	<i>íd</i> after nominal predicates and nominals in other functions	305
5.8	<i>íd</i> after finite verbs	320
5.8.1	<i>íd</i> and verbal accent	320
5.8.2	The functions of <i>íd</i> after a finite verb.	329
5.9	<i>íd</i> after local particles	343
5.10	<i>íd</i> after interrogative proforms	356
5.11	<i>íd</i> as a pronoun	359
5.12	Summary	365
6	The employment of <i>īm</i> , <i>ī</i> and <i>sīm</i> in the Rigveda	368
6.1	<i>īm</i> , <i>ī</i> and <i>sīm</i> as pronouns	374
6.1.1	Previous studies	374
6.1.2	The discourse prominence of the referents of <i>īm</i> , <i>ī</i> and <i>sīm</i>	383
6.2	<i>īm</i> , <i>ī</i> and <i>sīm</i> as particles	404
6.3	Summary	416
7	Conclusions	418
8	Acknowledgements	421
9	Abbreviations	422
10	Appendix	424
11	References	439

1 Introduction

This study investigates the functions of the forms *cid*, *íd*, *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* in Vedic Sanskrit, the oldest attested Indo-Iranian language. These forms can be regarded as a group in that they are assumed to have pronominal origin but synchronically, the literature has analyzed them as particles, or as fulfilling the functions of both a particle and a pronoun. Another common property is that they cannot be analyzed equally well in all portions of the Vedic literature but that they are used most productively, or even used only, in the Rigveda, the oldest attested Vedic text, which consists of religious poetry (Macdonell 1916: 218; 220; 230f.; 249).¹ As a result, the current study will be faced with two major challenges. The first one regards the nature of the corpus, which comprises the Rigveda. On the one hand, the text of the Rigveda, which was transmitted orally over centuries, is preserved exceedingly well and only in a small number of cases is the correctness of the text itself to be questioned. On the other hand, however, the Rigveda is characterized by poetic language and the interpretation of numerous passages has proven to be extremely difficult, even to the most renowned experts in this field (see Section 3). The second challenge regards the fact that the forms under investigation are particles. Goldstein (2019: 269–271), who works on Ancient Greek, observes that in many cases it is challenging to identify and to describe the functions of particles, so that especially in poetic texts they have often been considered to have no function apart from filling a syllable in the meter. This has also been the case for particles in Vedic (cf. Hejib 1984: iii) and, at least partly, for the forms that I investigate here (cf. Renou 1955–1969: I, 65). Moreover, even if it is acknowledged that particles have a function, this function is often described rather imprecisely as ‘emphatic’, because a close examination is required in order to determine the exact function of a particle (cf. Mumm 2004: 19). A related problem is that semantic analyses of particles in modern languages are often based on the acceptability or unacceptability of certain examples (see e.g. König 1993: 985). Of course, speakers’ intuitions are an unavailable source for analyses of a language that has been extinct for millennia. A further problematic aspect which Goldstein (2019: 269–271) mentions is the translatability of particles. Often a particle does not have an exact equivalent in another language, e.g. in English. Even if the function of a particle can be paraphrased by an English (approximate) equivalent, Goldstein points to the fact that the meaning of this paraphrase itself must be analyzed. With respect to Vedic, Gonda (1968a) mentions similar problems. In fact, all these problems also exist for the very forms that I will investigate here. Grammars and dictionaries often give a range of particles as translations of the

¹ *Cid* had become unproductive by the time of the Brāhmaṇas (Macdonell 1916: 231).

forms or describe them merely as emphatic and say that they can be translated by stressing the word with which they are associated. Following Brinton (2001: 140), such elements should be re-examined in light of modern linguistic theory and methods. This is the goal of the present study.

In light of the abovementioned challenges, it is all the more important that a thorough investigation of *cid*, *íd*, *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* take into account all Rigvedic attestations of the respective forms. Only then is it possible to unveil the full range of their functions, to discern their particle and pronominal uses properly and to identify potential counterexamples to certain analyses. How important a thorough investigation of a particle is shows the example of the Rigvedic particle *u*, the functions of which have been analyzed in several articles and monographies (Klein 1978a, 1978b, 1978c, 1985a: 6–62, 2016, Dunkel 1997b, Catt 2012; 2014: 71–82).

For *īm*, *ī* and *sīm*, such systematic analyses, which take into account all attestations of the forms, have already been conducted (Jamison 2002, Kupfer 2002: 128–150; 252–260, RIVELEX II, 245; 254–263) but nevertheless, several questions still remain open. For *cid* and *íd*, such investigations have not been conducted.²

The aim of this study is primarily to examine the synchronic functions of *cid*, *íd*, *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* in the Rigveda. At the same time, it is also intended to increase the understanding of these forms' predecessors in Proto-Indo-European. For the understanding of the proto-forms is highly dependent on the understanding of their reflexes in the attested languages, especially in their oldest stages. The Vedic language, and the Rigveda in particular, have been an indispensable source for the reconstruction of numerous aspects of the Indo-European proto-language, so that a synchronic analysis of the Rigvedic forms is valuable for diachronic investigations as well.

Even though an investigation of the language of the Rigveda is of special interest for the field of Indo-European studies, this book is not written specifically for an audience of Sanskritologists or Indo-Europeanists. Instead, it is intended to be of interest for researchers from other fields of linguistics as well, such as typologists who investigate particles and pronouns in the languages of the world or semanticists who attempt to provide a unified semantic analysis of different functions of a particle.

The structure of this study is as follows: In Section 2, I will provide the required theoretical background on focus particles and information structure. In Section 3, I will outline the relevant linguistic features of the Vedic language as well as the features of the corpus that I

² Apparently Holland (2009) took into account all attestations of *cid* in his investigation of this particle, but the results have never been published in written form. See my literature review in the beginning of Section 4 on this matter. RIVELEX (II, 157–162) also contains an entry for *íd* but in contrast to *ī* and *īm*, the different functions are not discussed.

use for my investigation. In addition, I will comment on my methodology and the presentation of my examples. The major part of this book is constituted by the detailed analysis of the forms *cid*, *íd*, *īm*, *ī* and *sīm*. Section 4 is dedicated to *cid* and Section 5 to *íd*. Each of these sections begin with a review of the previous literature on these particles. Then I will go on to examine their several functions. These different functions will be treated in separate subsections. However, especially in Section 5, the division of the subsections will not only be due to separate functions but may be due to different contexts. Thus, for instance I will assume the same functions of *íd* in Sections 5.8 and 5.9 but I will investigate them separately because *íd* occurs after different lexical classes. At the end of each section, I will summarize my findings. In Section 6, I will examine the forms *īm*, *ī* and *sīm*. I will begin with a review of the literature on these forms, which will show that there is discord among scholars as to whether they are to be analyzed as pronouns or as particles. Therefore, I will examine those cases in which they most probably have pronominal functions in Section 6.1 and those where they most probably function as particles in Section 6.2 and summarize my findings in Section 6.3. As I have mentioned above, detailed investigations of *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* have already been conducted by other scholars. In addition to a general literature review on these forms, Section 6 will therefore contain a detailed summary of these studies as well. In Section 7, I will give concluding remarks on my entire study.

2 Focus particles, information structure and related terms

As I will show in Sections 4 and 5, several of the translational equivalents that have been assigned to *cid* and *íd* can be characterized as focus particles. In addition, *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* have been analyzed as particles by several scholars so that they might fall under this category too. As a result, a basic understanding of focus particles is necessary to follow a thorough investigation of these Vedic forms. Typical examples of focus particles are English *even* and *only*. König (1993: 978) gives the following English examples:³

- (1) a. ***Even/only*** [*George*]_F writes poetry.
- b. *George even/only* [*writes*]_F poetry.
- c. *George writes even/only* [*poetry*]_F.

He explains that it is a typical characteristic of focus particles that they “interact with the focus-background structure of a sentence”. As Krifka (2008: 253) formulates it, they “are **associated with focus**” (his emphasis). Comparing the three sentences in ex. (1) shows that the interpretation of a sentence containing a focus particle is determined by what is to be interpreted as its focus. This means that the first notion that has to be defined in an analysis of focus particles is the term FOCUS. According to Krifka (1992: 18), semantically a sentence is divided into a focus part and a background part, which are in complementary distribution. With respect to the term FOCUS, I adopt the definition given by Krifka (2008: 247):

“Focus indicates the presence of alternatives that are relevant for the interpretation of linguistic expressions”.

As Krifka explains, this definition is based on Alternative Semantics by Rooth (1985; 1992). This is but one of several definitions of the term FOCUS. For instance, Halliday (1967: 204), speaking of “information focus”, defines it as “one kind of emphasis, that whereby the speaker marks out a part (which may be the whole) of a message block as that which he wishes to be interpreted as informative. What is focal is ‘new’ information”. Lambrecht (1994: 213) defines it as “[t]he semantic component of a pragmatically structured proposition whereby the assertion differs from the presupposition”. According to Erteschik-Shir (1997: 11), “[t]he Focus of a sentence S = the (intension of a) constituent c of S which the speaker intends to direct the attention of his/her hearer(s) to, by uttering S”.⁴ Yet, following König (1991: 32) a definition of focus involving alternatives is most suitable for the analysis of focus particles because this is exactly what can be observed with focus particles: “the focus of a particle relates the value

³ In all examples in this section I highlight the relevant forms by boldface type and adapt the notation of focus and scope to my system: I will use $[X]_F$ to indicate that *X* is the focus and, later on, $\$-Y-\$$ to indicate that *Y* is the scope of the particle.

⁴ Her definition is based on the notion of DOMINANCE (Erteschik-Shir & Lappin 1979).

of the focused expression to a set of alternatives”. Hence, in ex. (1) several alternatives to the expressions that are in focus are evoked. Alternatives to the a. sentence might be *Bill writes poetry* or *Mary writes poetry*. Alternatives to the b. sentence might be *George reads poetry* or *George recites poetry*. Possible alternatives to the c. sentence might be *George writes novels* or *George writes letters*. Krifka (2008: 258f.) explains that the set of possible alternatives to a focus can be restricted or unrestricted. As a clear example of a closed set he gives the following pair of question and answer:

- (2) A: *What do you want to drink, tea or coffee?*
 B: *I want [TEA]_F.*

Even though a focus with a restricted set of alternatives often seems to express contrast between these elements, Krifka (2008: 258f.) uses the term CONTRASTIVE FOCUS only for cases like corrections, where the proposition containing the focus is explicitly contrasted with another (inferable) proposition. I follow his use of the term. As another case apart from corrections he gives the following example:

- (3) A: *John wants coffee.*
 B: *[MAry]_F wants coffee, TOO.*

It is furthermore noteworthy that without context, one sentence can be ambiguous with respect to the size of its focus. König (1993: 978) illustrates this with the following pair of examples:

- (4) a. *What did John do? — He **only** [bought some apples]_F*
 b. *What did John buy? — He **only** bought [some apples]_F*

Even though the answers in both examples are identical, they differ in the size of the focus. Krifka (2008: 257) explains that with respect to this one may distinguish between BROAD and NARROW FOCUS (see also Taglicht 1984: 70–74), which I will do as well, but that one has to bear in mind that these labels are rather imprecise.

Taglicht (1984: 66–70) shows that there are also cases in which one sentence can have more than one focus. With respect to these cases, Krifka (1992: 20–24) makes a further distinction in that he differentiates between a complex focus on the one hand and multiple foci on the other hand. He illustrates the two types by means of the following examples:

- (5) *John **only** introduced [Bill]_{F1} to [Sue]_{F2}*
 (6) ***Even**₁ [John]_{F1} drank **only**₂ [Water]_{F2}.*

Krifka (1992: 20f.) explains that in the first example one focus particle has two foci whereas in the second example there are two focus particles which have one focus each.

After this overview on the notion of focus it is now possible to discuss the functions of focus particles in particular. However, before moving on with the discussion, a note on the

terms FOCUS PARTICLE and PARTICLE in general is necessary. Elements like *íd* and *cid*, and partly also *īm*, *ī* and *sīm*, have traditionally been categorized as particles and I will do so as well. In other words, for the sake of my study I am not concerned with a precise definition of the term PARTICLE, delimiting it from other categories. I follow Cook (1999: 181), according to whom “[p]articles are short, usually uninflected and invariable words, covering a wide range of grammatical functions”. I will furthermore distinguish between accented (or stressed) particles like *íd* and unaccented (or unstressed or enclitic) particles like *cid* (cf. Lühr 2017).⁵ Regarding focus particles, a number of different terms have been used for this group. Among them are FOCUSING ADVERBIALS (Nevalainen 1991) and FOCUSING MODIFIERS (De Cesare 2015) in English and GRADPARTIKELN (DEGREE PARTICLES) (Jacobs 1983) in German, to name but a few. An extensive overview of the different labels for these elements in the Literature on English, German, French and Italian is provided by De Cesare (2015). Among the multitude of labels, I opt for the term FOCUS PARTICLES, used in the seminal book by König (1991), because *íd* and *cid* are traditionally classified as particles, which makes the term suitable. Nevertheless, Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 4) correctly object that from a typological perspective the term PARTICLE is often unsuitable because the elements labelled by it may strictly speaking consist of more than one particle, like Swedish *till och med* ‘even’ (lit. ‘until and with’). Hence, when discussing typological data, I will sometimes use their term OPERATOR instead of PARTICLE to avoid such imprecision.

After clarifying the terminology on focus and particles, I will now discuss the different functions of focus particles. König (1991) identifies two major subgroups, namely additive particles and exclusive particles. In each of these groups, he further distinguishes between scalar and non-scalar (uses of the) particles. The first group are non-scalar, or simple additives like English *also*. König (1991: 62) explains that “[a]ll sentences with simple additive particles entail the corresponding sentence without particle and presuppose furthermore that at least one of the alternative values under consideration in a context satisfies the [predicate of the sentence]”. As an example, König gives the following sentence:

(7) *John also met [Mary]_F.*

According to his analysis, it entails that John met Mary and presupposes that John met someone else. For scalar additive particles like *even*, König (1991: 69) explains that they presuppose the sentence without the particle and conventionally implicate that the alternatives of the focus are ordered on a scale and that the focus is on a maximal position on the scale. For this type, he gives the following example:

⁵ For a syntactic definition of clitics involving both accented and unaccented forms see Lowe (2014).

(8) *Even [the president]_F came.*

According to his analysis, the sentence presupposes that someone else came and conventionally implicates that the president is on a high position of a scale. Applying the analysis of *even* by Karttunen & Peters (1979: 26f.), followed by Rooth (1985: 27), *the president* constitutes the least likely alternative,⁶ so that the scale evoked by *even* is one of likelihood, or rather unlikelihood. However, the assumption that the scale involved with *even* is one of likelihood is not unproblematic. As König (1991: 71) points out, there are cases in which *even* is used but no likelihood, or unlikelihood, is involved, as in the following sentence:

(9) *George drank a little wine, a little brandy, a little rum, a little calvados, and even a little armagnac.*

As one alternative, Kay (1990: 69) analyzes *even* by means of informativeness, which is “a relation holding between two propositions relative to a scalar model SM, in which the more informative one unilaterally entails the less informative one in SM”. He assumes that *even* indicates that its host proposition is more informative than its alternatives. König (1991: 73) shows a positive attitude towards such an analysis. Somewhat differently, Gast & van der Auwera (2011) assume that in a certain question under discussion, propositions have contextual implications. Thus, given a question *How dark are automobile seats?* The answer *They are black* has the relevant contextual implication *They are completely dark* (Gast & van der Auwera 2011: 9). They (2011: 9–11) assume that a scalar additive operator expresses that the proposition is pragmatically stronger than alternative propositions, which means that its relevant contextual implication entails the alternative contextual implications. However, even though the assumption of a likelihood scale is not always unproblematic, semanticists working on focus particles in English or other modern languages still assume that *even* primarily evokes a likelihood scale (cf. e.g. Krifka 1998: 111, Tomaszewicz 2012: 332). Given that the data on which my analysis is based are often difficult to interpret, I find it advantageous to work with a concept such as likelihood, which is easier to apply than abstract notions like INFORMATIVENESS or PRAGMATIC STRENGTH.

Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 6) also remark that it is not always clear that *even* always marks its focus as being in a maximal position on a scale. This has also been noted by Schwenter & Vasishth (2000). They distinguish between “absolute (inherently endpoint-marking) and relative (not inherently endpoint-marking) scalar particles” (Schwenter & Vasishth 2000: 232) and regard *even* as belonging to the latter group.

⁶ There may, however, be alternatives that are equally unlikely to have come.

In addition to scalar additive particles like *even* and non-scalar additive particles like *also*, there are additive particles which can be used both in a scalar and a non-scalar way. For instance, the German particle *auch* can occur both in the context of ex. (7) and ex. (8) (cf. Sudhoff 2010: 55f.).

The second major class of focus particles are exclusive particles like *only*. Following König (1991: 98) “[a] sentence with *only* presupposes the relevant sentence without particle and entails that none of the alternatives under consideration satisfies the open sentence obtained by substituting a variable for the focus expression”. He gives the following example:

(10) **Only** [John]_F came.

According to his analysis, the sentence presupposes that John came and entails that nobody other than John came. Comparing the semantics of additive and exclusive particles, it is noteworthy that “[t]he former do not seem to make a contribution to the truth conditions of a sentence, whereas the latter clearly do. The contribution made by *even*, *also*, *too*, etc. to the meaning of a sentence is generally characterized as presupposition or conventional implicature à la Grice” (König 1993: 980). As with additive particles, scalarity can also be observed with exclusives. König (1991: 100) gives the following examples:

(11) a. I **only** bought [three]_F apples.

b. He saw him **only** [briefly]_F.

c. He is **only** a [plumber]_F.

König explains that these examples clearly involve scales: In the a. sentence, all numbers higher than three are excluded, in the b. sentence longer periods of time are excluded and in the c. sentence higher social ranks are excluded. Thus, whereas the focus of scalar additive particles ranks high on a scale, the focus of exclusive particles ranks low. As exx. (10) and (11) show, *only* can be used both as a scalar and as a non-scalar particle. Yet, there are also exclusive particles like *alone*, which is always non-scalar, and like *but*, which is always scalar (Nevalainen 1991: 62). Note that some semanticists analyze all uses of exclusive particles as scalar (e.g. Coppock & Beaver 2014). However, for the primarily descriptive purpose of my study I follow the classification by König (1991).

In the context of exclusive focus particles, I would like to introduce a further subtype of focus that Krifka (2008: 259) discusses but that I have not mentioned until now, namely EXHAUSTIVE FOCUS. Based on Kiss (1998), who speaks of “identificational focus”, Krifka assumes that in English this subtype can be expressed by cleft-sentences like the following:

(12) **It's** [JOHN and BILL]_F **that** stole a cookie.

He explains that exhaustive focus “indicates that the focus denotation is the only one that leads to a true proposition, or rather more generally: that the focus denotation is the logically strongest that does so”. Hence, in ex. (12) there is no person in addition to John and Bill that stole a cookie. However, following De Cesare & Garassino (2015: 7) the sentence in ex. (12) presupposes *x stole a cookie* and it asserts that *x = John and Bill*. It therefore differs from sentences containing the exclusive particle *only*. That cleft sentences do in fact differ from sentences with exclusive focus particles, can be seen in the following examples from De Cesare & Garassino (2015: 12):

(13) *It is Stella who stole the cookies, **but not just her**.*

(14) *It is Stella, **among others**, who stole the cookies.*

In the literature, there is debate whether such sentences are acceptable but using the particle *only* instead of a cleft would certainly make them contradictory. Contrary to what Krifka (2008: 259) states regarding clefts, Umbach (2004: 166) defines the difference between exhaustive focus and the exclusive focus particle *only* in the following way: “The [exhaustive] focus variety excludes the possibility that someone instead of the focused item makes the proposition true, whereas the *only* variety excludes the possibility that someone in addition to the focused item makes the proposition true”.⁷ I will use the term EXHAUSTIVE FOCUS only in accordance with this definition. I furthermore follow De Cesare & Garassino (2015), who argue that with exhaustive focus, the exclusion of additional alternatives is conversationally implicated whereas it is part of the semantics of exclusive focus particles.

I have now discussed the basic functions of several subtypes of focus particles and it has become clear that, as is stated in the literature, their interpretation depends on what is assigned as their focus. However, following König (1991: 29–32) it is not only its focus that is relevant for the interpretation of a focus particle but also its scope, i.e. “the semantic counterpart of that part of a sentence that is relevant for spelling out [the] contribution” of the particle. Taglicht (1984: 142) distinguishes between unrestricted and restricted scope.⁸ By the former he means cases in which the scope of a particle extends over the entire (complex) sentence, e.g. in ex. (10) above. By the latter he means cases in which the scope only contains smaller portions. This may be the case when other scope-bearing elements, e.g. quantifiers are in the clause and take wide scope over the focus particle. Compare now the following examples by Taglicht (1984: 144):

⁷ Umbach (2004: 164–166) considers exhaustive focus to be contrastive and I therefore have replaced “contrastive” by “exhaustive” in the quotation.

⁸ Actually, Taglicht (1984) uses the term DOMAIN but I will follow the adaptation of the terminology by Nevalainen (1991: 69–73) and speak of SCOPE.

(15) $\$$ –**Only** [English]_F was spoken by– $\$$ some of the men

(16) $\$$ –**Only** [English]_F was spoken by some of the men– $\$$

In ex. (15), which means that some of the men were monolingual whereas others possibly spoke more languages, the existential quantifier is outside the scope of *only*, so that the latter is restricted. In contrast, in ex. (16), which means that no other language than English was spoken by any man, the quantifier is within the scope of *only* and therefore the scope of the particle is unrestricted. In the following example, the adverbial appears outside the scope of *also*, which is therefore restricted:

(17) *Fortunately*, $\$$ –*there is also* [another way]_F– $\$$

Taglicht (1984: 150f.) furthermore distinguishes between clausal and sentential scope. One pair of examples by which he illustrates the difference is the following one:

(18) *I knew* $\$$ –*he had learnt only* [Spanish]_F– $\$$
(I knew he hadn't learnt any other language)

(19) $\$$ –*I knew he had learnt only* [Spanish]_F– $\$$
(I didn't know he had learnt any other language)

In the first example, the scope of *only* is restricted to the subordinate clause, i.e. *only* has clausal scope. In the second example, the scope is unrestricted, so that *only* has sentential scope. Although it is correct that the scope of a particle deserves special attention when other scope-bearing elements are present in the clause (cf. Sudhoff 2010: 36), even without such elements present the scope of a particle may have different extensions, which affect the interpretation of a sentence. Consider the following examples from Taglicht (1984: 153):

(20) $\$$ –*For only* [£100]_F– $\$$ *he acquired the drawing*
(They didn't know its real value)

(21) $\$$ –**Only** *for* [£100] *did he acquire the drawing*– $\$$
(They drove a hard bargain)

Both examples have the same focus but they differ in the scope of *only*. In ex. (20) only the prepositional phrase is within the scope of the particle, so that Taglicht (1984) speaks of a local scope. This sentence means that £100 was a relatively low price for the painting. In contrast, the scope of *only* in ex. (21) contains the entire sentence and Taglicht (1984) speaks of sentential scope. This sentence means that £100 was a relatively high price for the painting.

One important phenomenon regarding scalar particles is related to the matter of scope, namely scale reversal. As exx. (8) and (11) show, the focus of scalar additive particles ranks high on a scale whereas the focus of exclusive particles ranks low. However, it has been observed in the literature that under certain conditions the respective scale can be reversed. Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 11f.) illustrate this for *even* by means of the following example:

(22) *I refuse to believe that Bill even* [slapped]_F *that man.*

Depending on the context, the scale induced by *even* can have different orders, as Gast & van der Auwera clarify by the following extensions:

(23) *Bill is accused of murder, but I'm sure he's innocent. In fact, I refuse to believe that Bill even [slapped]_F that man.*

(24) *I refuse to believe that Bill (not only [insulted]_F but) even [slapped]_F that man.*

The first context, where *slapped* ranks low on a scale of offenses, i.e. is more likely according to the analysis that I use, Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 13) call “scale-reversing” whereas the second context, where *slapped* ranks high on a scale of offenses, i.e. is an unlikely alternative, they call “scale-preserving”. Cases like these are not the only ones where such a scale reversal occurs. Forker (2016: 73) mentions also negation, antecedents of conditionals, questions, imperatives and subjunctives. The question is then how one can account for such reversals. Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 14–16) explain that there are two dominant views in the literature regarding this problem. On the one hand, authors like Wilkinson (1996) argue that in scale-reversing contexts *even* takes wide scope over operators like negation or the question operator. Thus, for ex. (23) Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 12) explain that it is equivalent to *I even refuse to believe that Bill [slapped]_F that man*, where *even* has sentential scope. Against this theory Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 15) follow the objection by Rullmann (1997: 48), namely that it assigns “wide scope to an element without any independent justification that this sort of exceptional scope assignment is actually possible”. On the other hand, authors like Rooth (1985) and Rullmann (1997) assume that *even* is ambiguous between a positive *even* and a negative *even*. As a major problem of this assumption, Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 16) cite the following pair of sentences, which is treated by Guerzoni (1997: 95):

(25) a. *Every student that even handed in [one]_F assignment, got an A.*

(26) b. *#Every student that even handed in [one]_F assignment, was wearing blue jeans.*

Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 16) explain that it is problematic to assume that negative *even* only takes clausal scope when the meaning of the whole complex sentence influences its usage. As a result, they (2011: 16f.) provide a third analysis, which combines the two approaches. They divide a sentence like ex. (20) into a local proposition $[[\textit{Bill slapped the man}]]$ and a host proposition $[[\textit{I refuse to believe that bill slapped that man}]]$. For the positive *even* they assume that, in their terminology, the local proposition is pragmatically strong whereas with negative *even* they consider this local proposition to be pragmatically weak but the host proposition to be strong. I will show in Section 4.10 that even under consideration of all three analyses it is difficult to account for the syntactic behavior of Vedic *cid*. At this point, I will not discuss the scale reversal of exclusive particles. See Sections 4.8 and 5.1 on this matter.

Thus far I have surveyed the two major subtypes of focus particles, viz. additives and exclusives. A third type that I would like to discuss here are PARTICULARIZERS. Nevalainen (1991: 57f.) distinguishes between three groups of particularizers, the first of which contains elements like *exactly*, the second of which contains elements like *at least* and the third of which contains elements like *especially*. Traugott (2006: 340) gives examples of the first and third group as instances of particularizers. In contrast, Quirk et al. (1985 [2008]: 604), König (1991: 96f.) and De Cesare (2015: 64f.) subsume second and third group under this term. I follow the latter view. One example of a particularizer that König (1991: 96f.) gives is the following one:

(27) *Especially* the girls objected to his manners.

König elaborates that particularizers are comparable to additive particles in that they require the proposition to be true for at least one alternative of the focus. He also observes that the alternatives of the focus are on a scale in that “[t]he alternatives under consideration do not manifest the relevant property as clearly”. Elements like *exactly*, which are not included in the group of particularizers, are according to König (1991: 125–138) used for emphatic assertion of identity. See Section 5.2 on this matter.

This concludes my survey of focus particles. Another category of particles that are relevant for this study are DISCOURSE PARTICLES, which are also called MODAL PARTICLES. These particles “are used in order to organize the discourse by expressing the speaker’s epistemic attitude towards the propositional content of an utterance, or to express a speaker’s assumptions about the epistemic states of his or her interlocutors concerning a particular proposition” (Zimmermann 2011: 2013). Modern German is a language that is particularly renowned for its abundant use of modal particles. Zimmermann (2011: 2013) gives the following examples:⁹

- (28) a. *Max ist ja auf See.*
 b. *Max ist doch auf See.*
 c. *Max ist wohl auf See.*

Max is **PRT** at sea

Zimmermann explains that in the first sentence the hearer is considered to already know Max’s whereabouts, whereas in the second sentence she is not; the third sentence conveys that the speaker is unsure about Max’s whereabouts. Several items, such as German *auch*, may function both as focus particles and as modal particles (König 1991: 173f.).

Since the bulk of my study is concerned with elements that function as focus particles, the notion of focus is of great importance. Yet, there is another important notion in information

⁹ He uses italics instead of boldface type.

structure, namely the TOPIC. The definition of this term is problematic and has been a subject of debate in the literature. However, in the data that I use for my investigation it is exceedingly difficult to identify topics anyway (see Section 3), so that a detailed discussion of this term would be futile. I simply assume that “[t]he topic of a sentence is the thing which the proposition expressed by the sentence IS ABOUT” (Lambrecht 1994: 118).

In this section I have introduced the concepts and terminology that are central to the understanding of my study. As a next step it is important to discuss the relevant features of the Vedic language and of the corpus upon which my study is based so that the reader may obtain a general understanding of the problems to which I have just alluded.

3 Corpus and methodology

The Sanskrit language comprises two varieties, on the one hand Vedic and on the other hand the younger Classical Sanskrit. As a corpus for my study I will use the Rigveda, the oldest attested text in Vedic Sanskrit, which was composed roughly in 1400–1000BCE (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 5). This choice is due to the fact that the forms under investigation are attested most abundantly in the Rigveda or are even non-existent in younger texts. The Rigveda can be characterized as religious poetry and primarily consists of hymns dedicated to gods. Before I begin my actual study, it is first important to outline the characteristics of Vedic and specifically of the language of the Rigveda that are important for understanding the analyses that I will provide.

A phonological characteristic of the Vedic language is the abundance of sandhi phenomena (cf. e.g. Macdonell 1916: 20–47). This means that the final segment(s) of a word are often changed due to the influence of the initial segment of the following word, but also the initial segment of a word may be altered and two words may be contracted. In the examples that I give in the course of this study, I will not resolve sandhi forms in general, but I will do so when I consider the respective forms vital for the understanding of the example. When I quote Vedic words in my text outside the examples, I will always give the underlying form. In addition to such external sandhi, there is also internal sandhi, which concerns combinations of segments within a word form. I will not be concerned with this in my study. Vedic had a pitch accent and the accent of every word, if present, is indicated by diacritics in the Rigvedic texts (Wackernagel 1896: 281–284).

Vedic is a case-marking language. The nominal inflection comprises 8 cases (NOM, ACC, INS, DAT, ABL, GEN, LOC, VOC), 3 numbers (SG, DU, PL) and three genders (M, F, N). The alignment is generally nominative–accusative.

Syntactically, Vedic Sanskrit can be described as a non-configurational language. Hale (1983: 5), establishes three major criteria for non-configurationality: “(i) free word order, (ii) the use of syntactically discontinuous expressions, and (iii) extensive use of null anaphora”. Examining data from Vedic prose, Reinöhl (2016: 33–40) observes that Vedic Sanskrit exhibits all three criteria. Regarding the first, Reinöhl (2016: 23) prefers to speak of “free constituent order”. Also based on an investigation of Vedic prose, Delbrück (1888: 16–18) establishes that the basic word order in Vedic is SOV. However, by means of the following passage from the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa, Reinöhl (2016: 33f.) shows that this order may vary:

- (29) *yády* *amúṃ* *vayám* *jáyema*
 if DEM:ACC.SGM 1PL.MOM defeat:OPT.1PL
 O **S** **V**
 ‘if we defeat that one’
- kám* *ajaiṣméti* *brūyāmátha*
 who:ACC.SG.M defeat:AOR.1PL+QOT say:OPT.1PL+now
O **V**
 ‘(we) will say: “whom did (we) defeat?”, Now,’
- yády* *asáv* *asmán* *jáyed*
 if DEM:NOM.SG.M 1PL.ACC defeat:OPT.3SG
 S **O** **V**
 ‘if that one defeats us’
- brāhmaṇān* *rājanyàbandhur* *ajaṣīd* *íti*
 Brahmin:ACC.PL.M friend.of.prince:NOM.SG.M defeat:AOR.3SG QUOT
O **S** **V**
 ‘the Brahmins, the fiend of the prince defeated’ ŚaB 11.6.2.5¹⁰

This example shows that different word order patterns may occur next to each other. Reinöhl (2016: 39f.) finds also passages which show that Vedic also exhibits the second criterion of non-configurationality, namely discontinuous expressions. One example that she gives is the following (see also Delbrück 1878: 58f.):¹¹

- (30) *sá* *dákṣiṇam* *evágre [= evá ágre]*
 DEM:NOM.SG.M right:ACC.SG.N PRT+at.first

godānam *vītārayati*
 beard:ACC.SG.N LP.comb:3SG

‘He first combs through the **right side of the beard.**’ ŚaB 3.1.2.5

In this passage, *dákṣiṇam* ‘right’ is the attribute of *godānam* ‘beard’, but nevertheless both the particle *evá* and the adverbial *ágre* ‘at first’ occur between them. This is therefore an instance of a discontinuous expression.¹² As for the third criterion, the following excerpt from an example that Reinöhl (2016: 35) gives illustrates the occurrence of null-anaphoras:

- (31) *so* *’bhimṛṣati*
 DEM:NOM.SG.M touch:3SG
 ‘He touches (**the Soma**)’ ŚaB 3.3.2.7

Here, the Soma, which is the object of the verb, is not expressed overtly. Hence, all three of Hale’s (1983) criteria are fulfilled. With respect to the second criterion, the presence of discontinuous expressions, Reinöhl (2016: 41) remarks that it correlates with a weak distinction

¹⁰ Whenever I quote examples from other authors I adapt their glosses to my system if necessary or, in case the author has not glossed the examples, add the glosses if I consider it necessary. In this particular case, the marking of S, O and V is Reinöhl’s. For my conventions regarding Rigvedic examples see the last paragraph of this section.

¹¹ I have added the accents on the Vedic text. Moreover, I have restored *ágre* instead of *āgre*.

¹² Reinöhl gives this as an example of true discontinuity. On the distinction between true and apparent discontinuity see Reinöhl (2016: 37–40).

between nouns and adjectives. I follow the terminology from Reinöhl (2016) and will speak of NOMINALS instead of NOUNS or ADJECTIVES and of NOMINAL EXPRESSIONS instead of NOUN PHRASES. However, for the sake of convenience, I will use the terms PRONOUN and PRONOMINAL next to each other.

Another feature of Vedic syntax that is of great importance for my study is the so-called “Wackernagel’s Law”.¹³ According to this rule, many clitics appear in the second position of the clause, i.e. after the first word. As Hale (2007: 194–200) observes, the Rigveda contains abundant evidence for this rule. One of the examples that he (2007: 196) gives is the following:

(32) *kéna* *vā* *te* *mānasā* *dāśema*
 what:INS.SG.N or 2SG.DAT mind:INS.SG.N worship:OPT.1PL

‘Or, with what mind should we piously serve you?’ RV 1.76.1d

This passage contains two enclitics, namely *vā* ‘or’ and *te* ‘to you’. These two forms occur in a chain after the first prosodic word of the clause. This rule applies not only to genuine clitics but also to accented particles (Hock 1989: 115). It is important to mention, however, that “Wackernagel’s Law” is to be regarded as a tendency rather than a strict rule (cf. Hock 1996: 246–262).

Since the corpus of my study will be limited to the Rigveda, it is necessary to provide some remarks about its structure and the features of its language in particular. For a recent detailed overview see Brereton & Jamison (2020). The Rigveda consists of ten books and each book contains a certain number of hymns, which again consist of several stanzas. As Jamison & Brereton (2014: 74) explain, a stanza usually consists of 3–4 *pādas*, which are metrical units consisting of a certain number of syllables, but the number of *pādas* may also vary.¹⁴ Jamison & Brereton (2014: 74) furthermore explain that in stanzas with 3 or 4 *pādas* there is a boundary after the second *pāda* which divides the stanza in two hemistichs or into one hemistich plus one *pāda*, respectively. Throughout my study I will refer to books, hymns and stanzas by numbers and to *pādas* by letters. For instance, RV 7.22.8a refers to the first *pāda* of the 8th stanza of the 22nd hymn in book 7. In my examples, I will indicate the boundaries between *pādas* and stanzas but I will not distinguish between simple *pāda* boundaries and hemistich boundaries. For several aspects of my investigation it is important to note that in the Rigvedic text only metrical boundaries are indicated but not syntactic ones. It is often the case that syntactic boundaries are located at metrical boundaries (Klein 2002: 232), but this is only a tendency and therefore cannot serve as a strict criterion.

¹³ The name has been given to this phenomenon because of the observations made by Wackernagel (1892).

¹⁴ Jamison & Brereton (2014) use different terminology: They use VERSE instead of STANZA and call a *pāda* a LINE.

In addition to its structure, it is also important to discuss the language of the Rigveda, for it has to be borne in mind that the Rigveda is a poetic text, and therefore its language differs from the Vedic prose texts not only in age but also in genre (cf. Hock 1997). For instance, as I have mentioned above, SOV has been observed as the basic word order in Vedic prose. However, Rigvedic clauses commonly deviate from this pattern (Gonda 1952: 43; Klein 1994: 99f.). Klein (2002: 231) explains that such deviations from the prose language do not constitute violations of the grammar but were rather used by the poets for stylistic reasons. Moreover, Klein mentions the meter as a further factor that influences the order of words. That does, of course, not mean that the language of the Rigveda is only governed by rules of style and metrics and that it is futile to search for linguistic reasons that are responsible for the form of the text (cf. e.g. Schnaus & Mull 2016: 102–109). However, the researcher has to bear in mind that all these factors may interact. The potential influence of stylistics and meter is not the only difficulty with respect to the Rigveda as a corpus. As Thomson (2004: 112) remarks, the Rigveda is often difficult to interpret and translate: “Words have in the past been assigned a broad range of meanings in order to make sense of the contexts in which they occur; and even then many of the contexts remain difficult, and some appear to resist interpretation altogether”. Moreover, de Macedo (2007: 104) remarks that the Rigvedic hymns often seem to consist of unrelated thoughts on which the poet does not elaborate. These factors further complicate the examination of particles, which themselves often have only a subtle function, and of pronouns, whose usage is often determined by the preceding or following discourse. A further problem regarding the Rigveda is that it does not constitute one homogenous text but that it was composed over a longer period of time. Therefore, not all portions of the Rigveda are of the same age. Generally, it can be said that books 2–7, which are called the “Family Books” are the oldest portion (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 10). For a detailed investigation of the age of the different portions of the Rigveda see Arnold (1905).

In my study, I consider all attestations of *íd*, *cid*, *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* in the Rigveda. A list of all attestations was provided to me by the VedaWeb project even before their corpus was available online. During the collection of the data, I primarily utilized the translations and commentaries by Grassmann (1876–1877), Oldenberg (1909–1912), Geldner (1951–1957), Witzel & Gotō (2007), Witzel et al. (2013),¹⁵ Jamison & Brereton (2014) and Jamison (comm.I.1)–

¹⁵ The third volume by Dōyama & Gotō (2022) was released only after I had collected the data. Even though I have not used this volume, which comprises books 6 and 7, while collecting the data I will draw on it in the discussion of several individual examples.

(comm.X.4).¹⁶ Other works that will play an important role in my analysis are the translations and commentaries by Ludwig (1876–1888), Griffith (1896–1897), Renou (1955–1969) and Hari D. Velankar (partial translations with commentaries published between 1948 and 2003). In the discussion of my examples, I will also draw on these translations and commentaries as well as others. Occasionally I will also refer to the commentary by the philosopher Sāyaṇa from the 14th century CE. However, I have not read his commentary myself and whenever I refer to this commentary I only refer to what western scholars write about it. Gonda (1968a: 98f.) correctly points to the perils of relying too much on translations when investigating the functions of particles, for translations of particles are often at best approximate equivalents and the exact function may therefore elude the researcher. Moreover, as he remarks, it may at times be not clear whether an apparent translational equivalent is really intended to render the function of a particle or actually intended to convey another aspect of the context. Likewise, he considers it a mistake to regard a particle as expletive when it is not reflected in the translation. As a result, I will not rely on the translations alone but justify my interpretations by means of the actual Vedic data. Thus, for instance, regarding the distinction between pronominal and particle use of *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* in Section 6, I will primarily consider formal criteria. Nonetheless, the translations may provide valuable information as to whether it is sensible to assume a certain interpretation of a pronoun or particle or not. Moreover, due to the interpretational problems of many Rigvedic passages mentioned above it is often necessary to consult and critically compare several translations in order to assess the overall meanings of the passages that serve as the basis for my analysis. As a result, I will use the translations as a valuable asset during my investigation. The translations that I will quote during my study are not only English but also German or French. For the convenience of the reader, I will in most cases provide English versions of the respective translations. Yet, I am fully aware that this might reduce the accuracy of the translations so that I will always give the original German or French translation in a footnote.

Especially in Sections 4 and 5, I will also make use of typological studies regarding focus particles and will also draw on descriptions of similar particles in other languages or in post-Rigvedic Sanskrit. Here as well, a certain amount of caution is due. As Goddard (2001: 27f.) states, a detailed semantic analysis of particles should not rely primarily on the comparison with

¹⁶ In the course of this study I will often refer to the commentary on the translation of the Rigveda by Jamison & Brereton (2014), i.e. Jamison (comm.I.1)–(comm.X.4). According to Jamison (comm.intro), the comments in the current version are only by Stephanie W. Jamison so that I will mention only her as the author, even though both authors are mentioned on the website. Jamison’s commentary has continuously been updated. In the discussion of my data, I always refer to the most recent version, which was uploaded in January 2024. During the collection of my data, I used older versions, which contained comments on less passages.

similar items other languages because in each language particles have specific subtle functions that may not be present with the apparent equivalent in another language. However, given the type of data on which I will base my investigation and the interpretational problems that exist with them, comparative data are an indispensable asset. Thus, I will justify the functions that I assume for *cid* and *íd* by comparing them with other focus particles. For the investigation of the pronominal functions of *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* in Section 6, I will use theoretical literature on the concept of prominence as well as studies on pronouns in English and German as the basis for my analysis.

As I have outlined, the interpretation of Rigvedic passages often poses severe problems so that often several competing interpretations exist. As a result, it is in many cases futile to give numbers as to how often a specific use of a form occurs compared to others. Large parts of my investigation will therefore consist of qualitative analyses. I will only give numbers for my analyses when I am able to define clear formal criteria that allow for quantification. Thus, for instance in Section 5.3 it is possible to say that *íd* occurs 59 times after the adverb *ād* ‘then’ but I am not able to determine how often it has which specific function in this context. In general, whenever I do not give specific numbers for a particular analysis, this means that I am not able to quantify my results. When I give numbers and do not mention all passages in the text, I give a list of all these passages in the appendix. I will not give a complete list of all attestations of the five forms under investigation. For a list of all attestations I refer the reader to the VedaWeb or to the concordance by Lubotsky (1997). In the Rigveda, there are pādas or even entire stanzas which are repeated somewhere. These passages may be repeated within the same hymn but also in different books. Whenever I give numbers, I count every instance, irrespectively of whether it is a repetition or not. This means that if e.g. a pāda contains the sequence *sādam íd* and this pada (or even the entire stanza) is repeated somewhere else, I will count two instances of *sādam íd*. The reason for this is that even repeated pādas may occur in different contexts and therefore a different interpretation of the particles may be possible.

In all the Rigvedic examples that I will give in my entire study, I have adopted the Vedic text from van Nooten & Holland (1994) and the English translation from Jamison & Brereton (2014), unless otherwise noted.¹⁷ The glosses are mine. In several cases when I have to provide larger contexts, I will only gloss those parts of the example that are most relevant. I use / to indicate pāda boundaries and // to indicate stanza boundaries in the Vedic text. As it is in most cases not relevant for my study, I do not distinguish simple pāda boundaries from hemistich

¹⁷ Unlike van Nooten & Holland (1994) I will not graphically indicate which sounds have been metrically restored.

boundaries. Following the conventions by van Nooten & Holland (1994: 2), the symbol · marks a pause which has the length of a syllable and ° marks an emendation they describe in their Metrical Notes. For the convenience of the reader I will type those forms which are the most relevant for my analysis in boldface, both in the Vedic text and in the translation. I will resolve external sandhi only in forms that are vital for my analysis. If two words are contracted due to external sandhi I will use the + sign in my glosses to separate their meaning, e.g. *ivéd* ‘like+PRT’ < *iva íd* ‘like PRT’. For all finite verbs, I regard present, indicative and active as the default tense, mood and voice, respectively. Hence, I will only include these categories in my glosses when they deviate from these default values. In each Rigvedic example, I give the book, hymn, stanza and pāda that my example comprises. If the example comprises the entire stanza, I do not give the pādas. Notice that the beginning/end of an example does not necessarily coincide with the beginning/end of a pāda. When I give Rigvedic examples from other authors, I will nevertheless give the text by van Nooten & Holland (1994) and the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014), unless otherwise noted. I will adapt the glosses to my system or add them in case the author has not glossed them. I will also type the relevant forms in boldface.

4 The employment of *cid* in the Rigveda

The particle *cid* is attested 691 times in the Rigveda. Depending on the following word, it can occur in the sandhi forms *cid*, *cit*, *cij*, *cic* or *cin*. The enclitic particle *cid* is a reflex of the Proto-Indo-European particle $*=k^h id$, which can be analyzed as a petrified NOM/ACC.SG.N of the unstressed interrogative/indefinite pronoun. (Mayrhofer 1992–2001: I, 543; Dunkel 2014: 448–451). Wackernagel & Debrunner (1930: 559) translate it as ‘sogar, jedenfalls’, similarly to Hillebrandt (1885: 88), who translates it as ‘sogar, selbst’. Grassmann (1873: 454f.) translates it as ‘sogar, selbst, auch’ and regards it as emphatic. Similarly Böhtlingk & Roth (1855–1875: II, 1025f.), who in addition translate it as ‘wenigstens’.¹⁸ Renou (1952: 376) renders it as ‘même, pourtant’. Geldner (1907–1909: I, 63) renders it also as ‘gar’. Cappeller (1891: 173) gives as possible translations ‘even, indeed, also, just, always, at every time’. With respect to the function of *cid* in RV 3.53.22, Jamison (comm.III: ad loc.) speaks of “its usual ‘even, even though, just’ sense” and also Gippert (2004: 54) translates it as ‘even, just’. Macdonell (1910: 81) translates it as ‘at all’. Gotō (2013: 73; 151) regards *cid* as an adverb that means ‘if any, even, at all’. Similarly, Mayrhofer (1992–2001: I, 543) translates it as ‘überhaupt, sogar’. Boley (2004: 151) observes that *cid* “is used to contrast the idea marked by it with another element”. More precisely, Lühr (2017: 284f. 2018b: 183) analyzes *cid* as “a scalar focus particle assigning to its domain an extreme position on a scale formed by its contextually relevant alternatives”. Tichy (1995a: 306–308) perceives that such use of *cid* can also be employed as a stylistic device. Especially with objects of agent nouns of the type *dātár-* ‘giver’ she finds that the particle is employed to convey that the gods also are supportive when the circumstances are unfavorable, which increases the hope for help. Lanman (1912: 156) describes it as an emphatic particle that can be translated as ‘even, just, at least’, as generalizing after a relative pronoun and (in Classical Sanskrit) as making an interrogative pronoun indefinite. According to Viti (2007: 190–192), Vedic *cid* marks “positive concession” or emphasis but it can also be indefinite. That a generalizing function of Vedic *cid* after interrogative pronouns, and also after relative pronouns, is also attested in Vedic has been observed widely in the literature (e.g. Delbrück 1874: 70, Grassmann 1873: 454f., Macdonell 1916: 230f., Briceño Villalobos 2019: 128–166). According to Macdonell (1916: 230f.), by the time of the Brāhmaṇas the generalizing function after interrogatives is the only employment of *cid* that remains. Several scholars even assume that indefiniteness or quantification is a primary function of *cid*. Kanta (1953: 101),

¹⁸ Like Böhtlingk & Roth, Osthoff (1881: 233) translates *cid* as ‘sogar, selbst, auch, wenigstens’.

translates it as ‘at all, any, some’ but also as ‘too, also’.¹⁹ Following Benfey (1852–1854: II, 115), *cid* can render a preceding interrogative as well as other forms indefinite and functions as a universal quantifier after plurals (cf. Benfey 1866: 305). Viti (2007: 190) acknowledges the indefinite function after mominals that she finds described in grammars. Thumb & Hauschild (1958–1959: I, 290) classify *cid* as an indefinite particle. Dunkel (1992: 158) appears to regard the function of *cid* primarily as indefinite (cf. also Dunkel 2014: 453). Rodríguez Adrados (1992: 172) regards it as emphasizing and generalizing. Gonda (1954–1955: 281–285) argues that in several instances, *cid* should be interpreted as a neuter indefinite pronoun like its Greek cognate $\tau\iota$.²⁰ Benfey (1852–1854: II, 115) also regards it as a comparative particle, as do Böhtlingk & Roth (1855–1875: II, 1025f.), Geldner (1907–1909: I, 63) and Sastri (1947: 39). This view is also held by the ancient Indian grammarian Yāska, according to whom *cid* may express respect, contempt or comparison (Sarup 1967: 8), and by Hejib (1984: 301), who regards *cid* as “concessive or comparative”.

One special context in which *cid* occurs is after the adverb *nū́* ‘now’. In several cases, the collocation *nū́ cid* has the meaning ‘never’ (see most recently Klein 2019). Syntactically, it has been observed that *cid* often occurs in the second position of the clause and therefore Hale (1987: 18f.) treats it together with other Wackernagel elements. However, like Delbrück (1888: 22), he observes that it may also occur later in the clause and therefore concludes that its occurrence in the second position is an epiphenomenon of the fact that the word it emphasizes often occurs in the first position. Consequently, Krisch (1990: 65) does not regard *cid* as a Wackernagel element. Even though Keydana (2011: 109) also portrays *cid* as a subtype of Wackernagel elements, he agrees with this view, as does Lühr (2010: 129).

Probably the most detailed investigation of *cid* has been conducted by Gary Holland, who presented his results at the 14th World Sanskrit Conference in Kyoto (Holland 2009). According to the abstract, all attestations of *cid* have been taken into account, but to my knowledge the results of this investigations have not been published in an article. Based on the handout, which comprises only four pages plus a half-page abstract, it is difficult to judge what exactly Holland’s findings are.²¹ According to the abstract, Holland analyzes *cid* as “a discourse marker signalling presupposed factivity” and concludes that “[t]he emphatic and generalizing meanings are thus context-specific reinterpretations of the discourse marker”. However, apart from quotations of Grassmann (1873: 454f.), Renou (1952: 376) and Mayrhofer (1992–2001: I, 543),

¹⁹ He compares it with the accented Greek $\tau\acute{\iota}$ as well as with Latin *quidem*. Interestingly, he gives a second lexeme *cit*, which he analyzes as an “emphatic particle, at all” and compares with Avestan *ciṭ* and Greek $\tau\iota$.

²⁰ By GREEK I will always refer to Ancient Greek.

²¹ Many thanks to Jared S. Klein for sending me the handout!

the actual handout displays only fifteen Rigvedic passages with English translations but no further comments.²² A detailed investigation of =*ci*, the Old Persian cognate of *cid*, has been conducted by Coenen (2020–2021 [2022]).

After this overview of the functions that have been assigned to *cid*, I will now begin to conduct my own detailed investigation of this form.

4.1 The functions of *cid* as an additive particle

The introduction to the section on *cid* has shown that one of the key functions that it has been assigned is that of an additive particle. As a result, I will start my investigation with a detailed analysis of this function. In order to do so, I will build on a variety of typological studies on additive operators and show which of their functions can be assigned to Vedic *cid*.

As I have outlined in Section 2, König (1991: 62–87) distinguishes between two major groups of additive particles. These two groups are simple additives on the one hand and scalar additives on the other hand. In different languages, there are particles that only have the function of simple additives, like English *also*, and particles that only have the function of scalar additives, like English *even* and German *sogar*; however, there are also particles which can be used in both ways, like German *auch* (De Cesare 2015: 66f.). The first step in the analysis of the function of *cid* is thus to determine under which of these three groups it can be subsumed. Compare the following examples:²³

- (33) *cātuḥsahasraṃ* *gáviyasya* *paśvāḥ* / *práty*
four.thousand:ACC.SG.N bovine:GEN.SG.M livestock:GEN.SG.M LP
- agrabhīṣma* *ruśámeṣu* *agne* / *gharmás*
grab:AOR.1PL Ruśama:LOC.PL.M Agni:VOC.SG.M gharma.pot:NOM.SG.M
- cít* [...] / *ayasmáyas* *tám* *u*
PRT made.of.copper:NOM.SG.M DEM:ACC.SG.M PRT
- ádāma* *víprāḥ*
LP.take:AOR.1PL inspired:NOM.PL.M

‘Four thousand bovine livestock have we accepted from the Ruśamas. **Also** the gharma pot, [...], the one made of copper, that too have we inspired poets taken.’ RV 5.30.15

- (34) *prātaryújaṃ nāsatyā ádhi tiṣṭhathaḥ* / *prātaryāvāṇam madhuvāhanam rátham* /
víśo *yéna* *gáchatho* *yájvarīr* *narā* /
clan:ACC.PL.F REL:INS.SG.M go:2DU sacrificer:ACC.PL.F man:VOC.DU.M

²² Holland gives the year 1990 in the reference for Mayrhofer’s entry of *cid*.

²³ As stated in Section 3, the text of all Rigvedic passages is adopted from van Nooten & Holland (1994) and all English translations of Rigvedic passages are quoted from Jamison & Brereton (2014), unless otherwise noted.

kīrés *cid* *yajñám* *hótṛmantam* *ásvinā*
 weak:GEN.SG.M PRT sacrifice:ACC.SG.M with.Hotar:ACC.SG.M Ásvín:VOC.DU.M

‘O Nāsatyas, you mount the early-yoked, early-driving, honey-bringing chariot, by which you go to the sacrificing clans, o men, and to the sacrifice **even** of a weak man, with its Hotar, Ásvins.’ RV 10.41.2

Ex. (33) describes what the inspired poets have received from the Ruśamas. The first thing that is mentioned here are four thousand cattle. In addition to these, they have received the gharma pot, i.e. the gharma pot is added to the things the poets have received. Hence, it is marked by *cid*. Here, these alternatives do not appear to be ranked on a scale, which is reflected in the translation of Jamison & Brereton (2014: 694), who render *cid* as the non-scalar additive particle ‘also’.²⁴ Consider now ex. (34). According to the relative clause, the Ásvins go to the sacrificing clans, or in other words to the sacrifices of the clans. Pāda d then adds another individual, or rather group of individuals, to whose sacrifice they go. As one would expect that the Ásvins prefer strong people, it seems unlikely that they go to the sacrifice of a weak man as well. Hence, *cid* can be considered as both additive and scalar here. Lühr (2017: 284f.) states that *cid* is “a scalar focus particle assigning to its domain an extreme position on a scale formed by its contextually relevant alternatives”. Indeed, it is true that *cid* can be associated with an element that assumes an extreme position, i.e. the endpoint, on a likelihood scale, as the following example shows:

(35) *sárvaṃ* *rājabhyaḥ* *paramā* *cid* *ánti*
 all:NOM.SG.N king:DAT.PL.M farthest:NOM.PL.N PRT before

‘Nigh to the kings is all, **even** what is farthest.’ (Macdonell [n.d.]: 27) RV 2.27.3d

The word *paramā*, which is associated with *cid*, is a superlative and denotes the things that are the farthest away from the kings. Hence, there is nothing which is less likely to be near the kings than what is referred to by *paramā*. However, pace Lühr (2017: 284f.), I will argue in Section 4.2 that the scalar use of *cid* marks its focus as a high point but not necessarily as an extreme point on the respective scale. Based on the classification by Schwenter & Vasisht (2000) I will therefore argue that *cid* is a relative scalar particle rather than an absolute scalar particle.

In addition to the previous examples, which exhibit clear scalar or non-scalar uses of *cid*, there are also examples where these two uses cannot be easily distinguished from each other, which is often conditioned by the fact that also apart from *cid* the passages allow different interpretations. One such passage is the following one:

²⁴ According to Geldner (1901: 168), Sāyaṇa interprets *cid* in this passage as a comparative particle ‘like’. In Section 4.9 I will argue that *cid* does not have this function and also Geldner (1901: 162) himself translates it as the additive particle ‘auch’ in this passage.

(36)	<i>evá</i>	<i>tád</i>	<i>índra</i>	<i>índunā</i>	/	<i>devéṣu</i>
	so	DEM:ACC.SG.N	Indra:NOM.SG.M	drop:INS.SG.M		god:LOC.PL.M
	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhārayāte</i>	<i>máhi</i>	<i>tyájah</i>		
	PRT	hold:SBJV.MID.3SG	great:ACC.SG.N	enmity:ACC.SG.N		

‘Thus, by the drop Indra will secure that great surrender (of the offering) **also** among the gods.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1630)

‘So Indra is by Indu’s power: **e’en** among Gods will it repel great treachery.’ (Griffith 1896–1897: II, 588)

‘Thus Indra may with the juice take upon them this great enmity **even** among the gods.’ (Geldner 1951–1957: III, 378)²⁵

‘Thus may Indra sustain his reckless drive (*tyajas*) **even** among the gods through Indu.’ (Velankar 1954: 13) RV 10.144.6ab

Since *cid* possesses scalar as well as non-scalar reading, it can be called a general additive operator (Gast & van der Auwera 2011; 2013). Gast & van der Auwera (2013: 128) state that in their sample all languages possessing general additive operators are also able to overtly mark scalar reading. The two possibilities they find are on the one hand adding a morpheme to the general additive operator and on the other hand using an explicitly scalar operator instead of the general one. At least in combination with *cid*, I have not identified such an element in the Rigveda. Identifying other potentially scalar operators is beyond the scope of this study. Notice, however, that there are in fact languages that do not possess an explicitly scalar additive operator. According to Koch & Zimmermann (2010: 244), the Salishan language N̄eʔkepmxcin, spoken in southwestern Canada, possesses the general additive operator *ʔelʔuʔ* but not an explicitly scalar one.

Having established the basic functions of *cid*, I will now begin to identify the contexts in which it occurs in order to obtain a more fine-grained analysis of its functions. In order to do so, I will first identify the lexical classes with which *cid* can occur, because according to Forker (2016: 72), there are additives in the language of the world that cannot occur with all lexical classes. Moreover, König (2017: 32) states that in several languages the difference in the focus of a particle correlates with a different lexical choice. He exemplifies this with the following French sentences containing exclusive operators:

- (37) a. *Seul Jean va se promener.* ‘**Only** John will go for a walk.’
 b. *Jean ne fait que se promener.* ‘John **only** goes for walks.’
 c. *Jean se promène seulement le dimanche.* ‘It is **only** on Sundays that John goes for walks.’

²⁵ ‘So mag mit dem Saft Indra diese große Feindschaft selbst unter den Göttern auf sich nehmen’.

The particle *cid* occurs together with nominals. Among these are nominals that are primarily property-denoting (ex. (38)) and nominals that are primarily entity-denoting (ex. (39)), as well as proper names (ex. (40)):

- (38) *sthirá cid ánnā dayate ví*
 hard:ACC.PL.N PRT food:ACC.PL.N divide:MID.3SG LP
jámbhaiḥ
 tooth:INS.PL.M

‘**Even** hard foods he fragments with his jaws.’ RV 4.7.10d

- (39) *utá svānáso diví śantu agnés / tigmāyudhā rákṣase hántavā u /*
máde cid asya prá rujanti
 elation:LOC.SG.M PRT DEM:GEN.SG.M LP break:3PL
bhāmā
 radiance:NOM.PL.M

‘And in heaven let there be the roars of Agni with their sharp weapons to smash the demonic. **Even** in his elation his (furious) radiance breaks forth.’ RV 5.2.10a–c

- (40) *tváṣṭā cit táva manyáva / índra*
 Tvaṣṭar:NOM.SG.M PRT 2SG.GEN fury:DAT.SG.M Indra:VOC.SG.M
vevijyáte bhiyá
 quiver:MID.3SG fear:INS.SG.F

‘**Even** Tvaṣṭar quivers with fear before your battle-fury, Indra.’ RV 1.80.14cd

In all cases, *cid* functions as a scalar additive particle. As for ex. (38), Agni fragments numerous kinds of food, among which hard ones are less likely than, for instance, soft ones. In ex. (39), it seems unlikely that Agni smashes demons in a state of elation because one would expect that a regular warrior needs to be angry to manifest his full power and to defeat such strong enemies (cf. Velankar 2003: 138f.). For Agni, both is possible. In ex. (40) it is unlikely that a god is among those who fear Indra’s fury. There is one instance in which *cid* occurs with the cardinal number *catúr-* ‘four’. I will argue in Section 4.4 that *cid*, like additives in some other languages, has a totalizing function in this context. In addition, *cid* occurs 3 times after *éka-*, which in these passages means ‘alone’ rather than ‘one’. I will argue in Section 4.6.3 that these are cases of concessive circumstantial secondary predicates. In addition to cardinal numbers, *cid* occurs three times after the multiplicative adverb *trís* ‘three times’. However, the function of *cid* in these passages is not entirely clear. In Section 4.4, I will assume somewhat tentatively that in this context it has the same totalizing function as with the cardinal numeral ‘four’.

In addition to the four groups of nominals that I have shown above, *cid* also occurs with pronouns.²⁶ These include personal pronouns (ex. (41)), demonstrative pronouns (ex. (42)) and one instance in which it occurs with a reflexive pronoun (ex. (43)). Moreover, *cid* occurs with pronominal adjectives (ex. (44)):²⁷

- (41) *yám* *agne* *vājasātama* / *tuvám*
REL:ACC.SG.M Agni:VOC.SG.M best.prize.winner:VOC.SG.M 2SG.NOM
- cin* *mányase* *rayám* /
PRT think:MID.2SG wealth:ACC.SG.M

tám no gīrbhīḥ śravāyiyam / devatrā panayā yújam

‘The wealth that **even** you hold in regard, o Agni, best winner of victory’s prize that yokemate of ours I will extol with songs as worthy of fame among the gods.’ RV 5.20.1

- (42) *tyám* *cid* *áśvam* *ná* *vājīnam*
ACC.SG.M PRT horse:ACC.SG.M like prizewinning:ACC.SG.M

‘(Unloose) **also** this one, like a prizewinning horse’ RV 10.143.2a

- (43) *svayám cin* *sá* *manyate* *dāśurir*
REFL PRT DEM:NOM.SG.M think:MID.3SG pious:NOM.SG.M

jāno / *yātrā sómasya* *ṛmpási*
man:NOM.SG.M where soma:GEN.SG.M become.sated:2SG

‘**Even** he himself considers himself a pious man at whose place you become sated on soma.’²⁸ RV 8.4.12ab

- (44) *sá* *hí* *satyó* *yám* *pūrve* *cid* /
DEM:NOM.SG.M for true:NOM.SG.M REL:ACC.SG.M ancient:NOM.PL.M PRT
- devāsaś* *cid* *yám* *īdhiré*
god:NOM.PL.M PRT REL:ACC.SG.M kindle:PERF.MID.3PL

‘For he is really present—the one whom **even** the ancients kindled, whom even the gods—’ RV 5.25.2ab

Further pronouns with which *cid* is attested are interrogative pronouns and relative pronouns. On these combinations see Sections 4.3.1 and 4.6.2.1. *Cid* also occurs together with adverbs, as the following examples show:

- (45) *tád* *adyā* *cin* *ta* *ukthíno* / *ánu*
DEM:ACC.SG.N today PRT 2SG.GEN reciting:NOM.PL.M LP
- ṣṭuvanti* *pūrváthā*
praise:3PL like.earlier

‘**Even** today do the reciters praise this (deed) of yours, as in the earlier way’ RV 8.15.6ab

²⁶ Following Crespo Güemes (2015: 215) and Maquieira Rodríguez (2017: 434–436), the ability to be associated with nouns and pronouns is a special property of focus particles (or focus adverbs in their terminology), which separates them from regular adverbs.

²⁷ The so-called pronominal adjectives are nominals which in some case-forms exhibit pronominal endings. Thus, *pūrve* ‘earlier, ancient’ in ex. (44) exhibits the pronominal ending *-e* instead of *-ās* (or *-āsas*) in the NOM.PL.M.

²⁸ According to the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1033), *svayám* appears to function as an intensifier here (cf. Section 5.5).

(46)	<i>sasváś</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>tanúvaḥ</i>	<i>śumbhamānā</i>
	in.secret	PRT	for	body:ACC.PL.F	preen:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.PL.M

‘Surely **even** in secret they keep preening their bodies.’ RV 7.59.7a

Moreover, *cid* can also occur after conjunctions and connective adverbs. For examples of this type see Sections 4.2 and 4.6.2.2. It also occurs once after the prohibitive particle *má*, but probably not with an additive function as I will argue in Section 4.8.

There are two cases in the Rigveda where *cid* occurs after a finite verb. In one of them, the verb is certainly finite but in the other one, the preceding form may also be interpreted as an entity-denoting nominal:²⁹

(47)	<i>mahīm</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dyām</i>	<i>átanot</i>	<i>śúriyeṇa</i>	/
	great:ACC.SG.F	PRT	heaven:ACC.SG.F	LP.stretch:IPRF.3SG	sun:INS.SG.M	
	<i>cāśkám̐bha</i>	<i>ciť</i>	<i>kám̐bhanena</i>	<i>śkábhīyān</i>		
	prop:PERF.3SG	PRT	prop:INS.SG.N	prop:COMP.NOM.SG.M		

‘With the sun he stretched through the very great heaven. He **also** propped it up with a prop, (himself) a better prop (than the prop).’³⁰ RV 10.111.5cd

(48)	<i>vidā</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>nú</i>	<i>mahānto</i>	<i>yé</i>	<i>va</i>
	know:PERF.2PL	PRT	now	great:VOC.PL.M	REL:NOM.PL.M	2PL.GEN
	<i>évā</i>	/	<i>brávāma</i>	<i>dasmā</i>	<i>vāriyaṃ</i>	
	way:NOM.PL.M		speak:SBJV.1PL	wonderful:VOC.PL.M	choice:ACC.SG.N	
	<i>dádhanāḥ</i>					
	take:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.PL.M					

‘You **indeed** yourself know what your intentions are, O great gods! Let us praise them, O wonder-workers, claiming to ourselves a covetable gift (thereby).’ (Velankar 2003: 84)

‘**Just** by our knowledge, o great ones [=Maruts], we shall say which are your ways, wondrous ones, as we acquire what is choice.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 709) RV 5.41.13ab

In ex. (47), Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1578) translate the second occurrence of *cid* as the non-scalar additive particle ‘also’. They appear to interpret *śkábhīyān* ‘better propping’ to be outside the clause so that the focus of *cid* is *cāśkám̐bha ... kám̐bhanena* ‘propped up with a prop’.³¹ This can then be interpreted as an alternative value to the predicate *átanot* ‘stretched through’ in pāda a. This is in accordance with other translators like Velankar (1954: 3), who do not translate *cid* but see the two pādas as a sequence of two events, i.e. the action of propping heaven with a prop is added to the event of stretching through it. Dunkel (2009: 41), who only

²⁹ According to Bartholomae (1888: 73, 1904: 594), *cid* never occurs after a finite verb in the Rigveda.

³⁰ Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1578) translate pāda c as ‘With the sun he stretched through heaven, though it is great’. However, I believe that since it is a permanent property, *mahīm* is not a secondary predicate, so that I regard it as an attribute and *cid* as a degree modifier (cf. Section 4.5).

³¹ Kümmel (2000: 573) regards *kám̐bhanena* as an adjunct of *śkábhīyān* and therefore as outside the focus of *cid*: ‘Auch den großen Himmel spannte er [Indra] aus mit der Sonne, **gestützt hat er ihn** auch, mit einer Stütze sicher stützend’ (his boldface type).

briefly mentions the two text passages under discussion, renders *cāskāmbha cit* as ‘he even supported’. I believe that such a scalar interpretation of *cid* is possible here too. This would mean that the actions of stretching through and propping with a prop are ranked on a scale. It is possible that the poet considers the latter as more important or more astounding, and hence more unlikely, than the former one. Support for this view can be found in the fact that with the apparently extra-clausal *skābhīyān* ‘a better prop’, the poet again stresses the extraordinary strength of Indra.

If the form that precedes *cid* in ex. (48) is to be interpreted as a finite verb, it should be the second person plural perfect *vidá*, which has the long variant *-ā́* instead of short *-á* (Velankar 2003: 218; see Arnold 1905: 112f. on the long variant). Ludwig (1876–1888: I, 219; IV, 206) finds *pāda* difficult to interpret with a second person and prefers to read it as a first person plural. He is followed by Griffith (1896–1897: I, 504): ‘We know your ways, ye Mighty Ones’.³² This is, however, clearly not in accordance with the transmitted text, as the first person plural would be *vidmá*. Renou (1955–1969: V, 21) translates it as a first person singular but Jamison (comm.V: ad loc.) surmises that he has simply mistaken *vidá* for *véda*, which is the actual form of the first person singular.³³ Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 192), Geldner (1951–1957: II, 41) and Witzel et al. (2013: 270) do interpret *vidá* as a second person plural (cf. Jamison comm.V: ad loc.), but they render *cid* differently. Geldner renders it as an exclusive particle whose focus is the null subject of the clause.³⁴ Grassmann renders it as the modal particle ‘ja’, which is probably used to express that the “proposition is commonly known” (Gast 2008: 162 following Rinas 2006: 154) and thus marks the utterance as a trivial update (Gast 2008: 162).³⁵ In contrast, Witzel et al. (2013: 270) translate *cid* as ‘certainly’ (‘gewiß’).³⁶ It appears that they assume *cid* to scope over *vidá* and to express that the subject possesses a high degree of knowledge. Such a function might be related to the degree modifying function that *cid* can have with property-denoting nominals (cf. Section 4.5), but I am not certain whether it also exists for verbs. Again not elaborating on this passage, Dunkel (2009: 41) translates *vidá cid* as ‘you (pl.) even know’. From this it does not become clear what he regards as the focus of *cid*, but in neither possible case do I find this interpretation adequate. For as the suggested interpretation as a modal particle shows, the utterance does not contain any alternatives that may be regarded as unlikely. It is neither surprising that the addressees know (and not only guess) their own

³² Ludwig (1876–1888: I, 219) translates: ‘wir wissen fürwar, o mächtige, was eure weisen’.

³³ ‘Je sais en vérité, (dieux) puissants, quels sont vos comportements’ (Renou).

³⁴ ‘Ihr allein, ihr Großen, wisset, welches eure Absichten sind’.

³⁵ ‘Ihr grossen kennt ja eure eignen Gänge’ (Grassmann).

³⁶ ‘Ihr wißt nun gewiß, ihr Großen, welche eure Wege sind’.

intentions, nor is it surprising that they know their own intentions or ways. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 709) and Jamison (comm.V: ad loc.) have a different approach to this passage. They follow Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 337) and do not regard *vidā́* as a verb form but as the instrumental singular of the feminine noun *vid-* ‘knowledge’. Consequently, they do not assume a clause boundary after *pāda* a and take the predicate to be *brāvāma* ‘we will say’. They translate ‘Just by our knowledge, o great ones [=Maruts], we shall say which are your ways, wondrous ones, as we acquire what is choice’. They interpret *cid* as an exclusive particle (cf. Section 4.8). In her typological study of additives, Forker (2016: 72) does not find many languages in which additive operators occur with finite verbs and if they do they are actually associated with another part of the clause. Since there is only one clear example in the Rigveda where *cid* follows a finite verb, it is difficult to determine the function it has in this position. In addition, another question regarding prosody has to remain unanswered: According to Boehtlingk (1845: 42), who follows the Indian Grammarians, and for instance according to Böhtlingk & Roth (1855–1875: II, 1026), Monier-Williams (1899: 398) and Viti (2007: 44), who also follow Pāṇini, *cid* has the ability to cause a finite verb, which is usually unaccented in main clauses, to bear an accent. However, the Rigvedic evidence at least does not support this claim. For in exx. (47) and (48), the accented verb followed by *cid* occupies the first position both in the clause and in the *pāda*. In this position, finite verbs have to be accented regardless of the presence or absence of a following particle (see Section 5.8 on the general rules of verbal accentuation and the effect of a following *íd*). Hence, it remains unknown whether *cid* actually had an effect on immediately preceding finite verbs in Rigvedic times.

Cid occurs 21 times after local particles.³⁷ According to Reinöhl & Casaretto (2018: 242–244), local particles constitute one group of spatial adverbs, which may also exhibit verbal or nominal orientation. This means that “they semantically modify, and syntactically combine with, a verb or a local case form”. For a more detailed treatment of local particles see Section 5.9. With respect to the particle *u*, Klein (1978b: 148) observes that the employment after preverbs, i.e. local particles, is comparable to the employment after finite verbs and in Section 5.9, I will argue that the same holds true for *íd* after verbally oriented local particles and those that function as adverbs, which are often difficult to distinguish. The employment of additive *cid* after local particles can be seen in the following example:

³⁷ This number contains 7 instances of *ā cid*, where it is not always certain whether *ā* is a local particle or emphatic. In one of these the particle *u* occurs between *ā* and *cid*. On the latter case see Geldner (1907–1909: I, 22) and Renou (1952: 374f.). Casaretto (2012) also treats the form *purā́* ‘earlier’ together with local particles. These passages are not included here. On *purā́ cid* see Section 4.4.

(49)	<i>ádha</i>	<i>dyaúś</i>		<i>cit</i>	<i>te</i>		<i>ápa</i>	<i>sá</i>		<i>nú</i>
	then	heaven:NOM.SG.M		PRT	2SG.GEN		LP	DEM:NOM.SG.F		now
	<i>vájrād</i>	/	<i>dvitānamad</i>				<i>bhiyāsā</i>	<i>svásya</i>		
	mace:ABL.SG.M		doubly+bow:IPRF.3SG				fear:INS.SG.F	own:GEN.SG.M		
	<i>manyóḥ</i>	/	<i>áhiṃ</i>		<i>yád</i>	<i>índro</i>		<i>abhí</i>		
	fury:GEN.SG.M		serpent:ACC.SG.M		when	Indra:NOM.SG.M		LP		
	<i>óhasānaṃ</i>	/	<i>ní</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>viśvāyuh</i>					
	vaunting:ACC.SG.M		LP	PRT	full.lifespan:ACC.SG.N					
	<i>śayáthe</i>		<i>jaghāna</i>							
	lair:LOC.SG.N		hit:PERF.3SG							

‘Then even Heaven, she [=Earth] likewise also, bent away from your mace, through fear of your own battle fury, when Indra **even** struck down the vaunting serpent to lie there for a full lifespan’³⁸ RV 6.17.9

Whether *cid* after the local particle in ex. (49) is to be analyzed as an equivalent of the one after ex. (47) is not entirely certain, especially because there is only one clear case of the latter context. One might wonder whether in ex. (49) there is narrow focus on the local particle, i.e. ‘(not only did he strike the serpent), he even struck the serpent DOWN’.³⁹ A point in favor of focused *ní* is that on the one hand, *han-* can have the meaning ‘hit/strike’ in Vedic besides the meaning ‘slay/kill’ (see e.g. García-Ramón 1998: 147f.). Thus, it is possible that in ex. (49) a contrast between ‘strike DOWN’ and just ‘strike’ is expressed. On the other hand, *han-* with the object *áhiṃ* ‘serpent’ is often formulaic and has the meaning ‘kill’ (e.g. García-Ramón 1998: 147f.). In light of this, it seems rather unlikely that ‘strike DOWN’ is to be regarded as an alternative to ‘kill’, since ‘kill’ implies that the patient falls to the ground. It is also possible that the focus includes also the object, so that striking down the vaunting serpent is an alternative of other deeds of Indra. Notice also that this clause contains another local particle, viz. *abhí*, which is in adnominal position to the object (Schneider 2009 [2010]: 151; Casaretto 2010 [2011]: 143f.). Generally, the Rigvedic data do not point to a uniform function of *cid* after local particles. In ex. (91) of Section 4.2 I will argue that the focus of *cid*, which follows *ví*, is the entire clause and that it functions as a discourse marker. In ex. (274) in Section 4.8 I consider *cid* to mark narrow exhaustive focus on the local particle *tiráś*.

In addition to local particles, *cid* also occurs twice after the preposition *rté* ‘without’, which possibly derives from a locative singular (RIVELEX II, 481). The two passages are RV 8.2.39 and the following example from a passage that is rather difficult to interpret (Oldenberg 1909–1912: II, 72f.; Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1021):

³⁸ The translation deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

³⁹ Cf. Dōyama & Gotō (2022: 42): ‘da Indra, der jede Lebenskraft hat, die prahlerische Schlange sogar zu Boden niedergeschlagen hat, daß sie dalag?’.

(50)	<i>yá</i> REL:NOM.SG.M	<i>rté</i> without	<i>cid</i> PRT	<i>abhiśriṣaḥ</i> bandage:ABL.SG.F	/ [...] /
	<i>sáṃdhātā</i> LP.putter:NOM.SG.M	<i>samdhím</i> join:ACC.SG.M			

‘He [=Indra] who, **even** without a bandage, [...] joins together the join’ RV 8.1.12a–c
The expression *rté ... abhiśriṣaḥ*, might also be interpreted as ‘without clasping/taking hold’ (Jamison comm.VIII.1: ad loc.). Even so, the expression denotes an unlikely circumstance under which Indra heals injuries. Since the poet probably does not intend to convey that this is the only circumstance under which Indra can heal injuries, *cid* can be interpreted as a scalar additive particle. Note that the focus is the complex expression *rté ... abhiśriṣaḥ* and not just *rté*.

As the examples that I have shown thus far demonstrate, *cid* does not appear to be restricted with respect to the lexical class of its focus. Yet, such a restriction might exist for syntactic categories. Thus, Hole (2008) finds that in Vietnamese, different particles are used for arguments and non-arguments. However, it follows from the previous examples that such a distinction does not apply to Vedic *cid*. In ex. (40) it occurs with a subject, in ex. (42) with a direct object, in ex. (36) with an adjunct and in ex. (47) with a predicate. The following case is extraordinary in that *cid* possibly follows an initial vocative, which is not a proper part of the clause:

(51)	<i>yásya</i> REL:GEN.SG.M	<i>tridhātu</i> triple:ACC.SG.N	<i>ávṛtam</i> uncut:NOM.SG.N	/	<i>barhís</i> ritual-grass.NOM.SG.N		
	<i>tasthāv</i> stand:PERF.3SG	<i>ásamdinam</i> unbound:NOM.SG.N	/	<i>ápas</i> water:VOC.PL.F	<i>cin</i> PRT	<i>ní</i> LP	
	<i>dadhā</i> put:PERF.2PL	<i>padám</i> trace:ACC.SG.N					

‘Whose ritual grass still stands uncut, not yet triply bundled—**Even** you waters have left your traces.’⁴⁰ RV 8.102.14

In pāda c, *cid* follows *ápas* ‘waters’. According to Grassmann (1873: 70), Geldner (1907–1909: II, 138), Velankar (1957: 22), Lubotsky (1997: 80) and RIVELEX (I, 258f.) this form is a vocative. However, the form *ápas* is ambiguous. Vocatives that are pāda-initial are not unaccented as in other positions but bear an accent on the first syllable (Haskell 1885: 57). This allows for the interpretation of *ápas* as a vocative, but the nominative plural of this lexeme also has its accent on the first syllable. Hence, the form *ápas* is ambiguous. Oldenberg (1909–1912: II, 152) therefore assumes that this form is a nominative and not a vocative and Ludwig (1876–

⁴⁰ The translation of pādas a/b is adopted from Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1214), the translation of pāda c follows Geldner (1951–1957: II, 433).

1888: IV, 390) even adduces the presence of *cid* as an argument against a vocative interpretation. On the other hand, the nominative interpretation is problematic because the predicate of the clause is in the second person (Velankar 1957: 22). Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1214) elude the problem by assuming that the focus of *cid* is not *ápas* but *padám* ‘footprint’, which occurs later in the clause: ‘even his footprint you waters have deposited’. Renou (1955–1969: XIII, 81) attempts to solve the issue by treating *ápas* as an apposition of a null second person pronoun.⁴¹ It is especially hard to judge which of these interpretations is correct because the general interpretation of this stanza is unclear (Geldner 1951–1957: II, 433; Jamison comm.VIII.2: ad loc.; Velankar 1957: 22), which complicates the analysis of *cid*.

A further observation that König (2017: 33) makes is that some additive operators are restricted with respect to the presence or absence of negation within their scope, which he (1991: 63) exemplifies by the contrast *too* vs. *either* in English:

(52) a. *You cannot eat THIS, as well/too.*

b. *You cannot eat THIS, either.*

In the first sentence, *as well/too* is within the scope of the negation (you can eat potatoes but you cannot eat this in addition), whereas in the second sentence *either* takes wide scope over the negation (you cannot eat potatoes and you cannot eat this). Moreover, *either* only occurs with negation (König 1991: 30f.). As is evident from the examples that I have already shown, *cid* can appear in positive contexts, i.e. without any negative element nearby. That it can possibly also appear with a negator in its scope can be seen in the following example:

(53) *ugrásya* *cin* *manyáve* *nā́* *namante*
 mighty:GEN.SG.M PRT fury:DAT.SG.M NEG+LP bow:MID.3PL

‘**Even** to the battle fury of the mighty they do not bow’ RV 10.34.8c

Even though I surmise that *cid* takes scope over the negative proposition ‘they do not bow to the battle fury of the mighty’, I will outline in Section 4.10 that I see no empirical way to test the scope relations between scalar *cid* and a negator. Ex. (53) appears to exhibit the scalar use of *cid*. I have not identified a clear example of non-scalar *cid* in a negative context in the Rigveda. The clearest case where *cid* expresses non-scalar additive meaning and has scope over a negation is ex. (95) below. However, here it co-occurs with the particle *u* after the conjunction *utá* ‘and, also’, so that this example is not exactly comparable to the non-scalar use in ex. (33) above. I have not found a clear passage where non-additive *cid* takes narrow scope with respect to a negator either. In ex. (58) I will show a passage where I surmise that scalar *cid* takes narrow

⁴¹ ‘(Cet Agni) de qui la litière-rituelle à trois strates se tient-toujours-là, non tournée, non liée ensemble, / (vous) mêmes, les Eaux, avez tenu cachée (sa) trace’

scope with respect to *ná* ‘not’. Notice again, however, that it is unclear whether the relative positions of *cid* and the negator are really indicative of their scope relations, so that my analysis here is only tentative.

In their crosslinguistic studies of European and Transeurasian languages, Gast & van der Auwera (2011, 2013) provide a detailed classification of different uses that are attested for scalar additive operators. Exx. (33) and (34) have already shown that Rigvedic *cid* is not a pure scalar operator like English *even* but that it is a general additive operator like German *auch*. Nevertheless, I will use the studies by Gast & van der Auwera (2011, 2013) in order to identify the exact contexts in which *cid* occurs when it has scalar function. The first distinction that Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 18f.) draw is one between beyond-operators like German *sogar* and beneath-operators like German *auch nur* and English *so much as*. They illustrate the difference between those groups by means of the following examples:

(54) a. *Ich weigere mich zu glauben, dass Willie den Mann sogar
I refuse me to believe that Bill the man even
geohrfeigt hat.
slapped has*

‘I refuse to believe that Bill **even/*so much as** slapped that man.’

b. *Ich weigere mich zu glauben, dass Willie den Mann
I refuse me to believe that Bill the man
auch nur geohrfeigt hat.
so much as slapped has*

‘I refuse to believe that Bill **even/so much as** slapped that man.’

Sentence a. is uttered in a context in which the speaker considers slapping a severe offense, for instance compared to yelling at the man. This means that it is unlikely that he slapped the man. In sentence b., the speaker considers slapping a relatively harmless offense, for instance compared to stabbing the man. Here, slapping is a likely alternative compared to offenses that may be committed, i.e. the scale is reversed. Gast & van der Auwera explain that *auch nur* and *so much as* are just used when, in their terminology, the local proposition is pragmatically weak, i.e. when their “local proposition [...] is located lower than (‘beneath’) the relevant context propositions on that scale”. In contrast, *sogar* is employed for pragmatically strong propositions. *Even* can be used in both contexts. The Rigvedic data show that *cid* can be employed as a beyond-operator. This is illustrated by ex. (55):

(55) *diyauś cid asya ámavāñ
heaven:NOM.SG.M PRT DEM:GEN.SG.M impetuous:NOM.SG.M
áheḥ svanáđ / áyoyavīđ bhiyāsā
serpent:GEN.SG.M sound:ABL.SG.M retreat:INT.IPRF.3SG fear:INS.SG.M*

<i>vájra</i>	<i>indra</i>	<i>te</i>
mace:LOC.SG.M	Indra:VOC.SG.M	2SG.GEN

‘**Even** formidable heaven kept retreating from the sound of this serpent and in fear at your mace, Indra’ RV 1.52.10ab

This text passage describes the famous battle between Indra and his enemy Vṛtra (cf. Jamison & Brereton 2014: 166). Heaven is explicitly described as *ámavān* ‘mighty, formidable’ Moreover, heaven has never been seen retreating by human beings (apart from the world of mythology). It is therefore clear that ‘formidable heaven’ is an unlikely candidate and thus, again in the terminology of Gast & van der Auwera (2011), the proposition hosting *cid* in this example is pragmatically strong. Hence, *cid* functions as a beyond-operator. The same analysis holds true for ex. (34) above. In addition to functioning as a beyond-operator, *cid* is also able to function as a beneath-operator, as ex. (56) shows:

(56)	<i>áchā</i>	<i>ca</i>	<i>tvainā</i>		<i>nāmasā</i>		<i>vādāmasi</i>	/
	LP	and	2SG.ACC+DEM:INS.SG.N		obeisance:INS.SG.N		speak:1PL	
	<i>kīm</i>	<i>múhuś</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>ví</i>	<i>dīdhayaḥ</i>			
	PRT	for.a.moment	PRT	LP	think:PERF.SBJV.2SG			

‘When we address you with this homage, will you hesitate **even** for a moment?’ RV 8.21.6ab

Among the different lengths of time spans that Indra, the addressee of this hymn, can take to hesitate, ‘a moment’ is particularly short, so that again the scale is reversed. Geldner (1951–1957: II, 325) translates *cid* with the German beneath-operator *auch nur*.⁴² According to Forker (2016: 73), questions, like that in ex. (56), are one of the typical contexts for such a scale-reversal. Another example where I suggest an interpretation of *cid* as a beneath-operator is the following. Here, an interpretation of *cid* is difficult otherwise:

(57)	<i>ráthaṃ</i>	<i>kām</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>amartiya</i>	/
	chariot:ACC.SG.M	who:ACC.SG.M	PRT	immortal:VOC.SG.M	
	<i>anyám</i>	<i>asmád</i>	<i>ririṣeḥ</i>	<i>kām</i>	<i>cid</i>
	other:ACC.SG.M	1PL.ABL	harm:AOR.OPT.2SG	who:ACC.SG.M	PRT
	<i>adrivo</i>	/	<i>rírikṣantaṃ</i>	<i>cid</i>	
	with.stone:VOC.SG.M		harm:DES.PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.SG.M	PRT	
	<i>adrivaḥ</i>				
	with.stone.VOC.SG.M				

⁴² Geldner translates: ‘Wenn wir dich mit dieser Verbeugung einladen, was wirst du dich auch nur einen Augenblick besinnen?’.

‘Every chariot, o immortal one—you should harm every other one apart from us, o possessor of the stone, who **so much as** intends to harm (us), o possessor of the stone’
RV 1.129.10e–g⁴³

The first two instances of *cid* form an indefinite pronoun with the preceding interrogative pronoun probably expressing universal quantification (cf. Section 4.3.1). Grassmann (1873: 454f.) assumes that the third instance of *cid* also functions as a universal quantifier. Apparently, this view is shared by Heenen (2006: 47).⁴⁴ However, in Section 4.4 I will argue that *cid* alone cannot have this function. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 298), who assume a different structure of the stanza (see Jamison comm.I.2: ad loc.), leave *cid* untranslated. They translate *pādas f/g* as ‘Another one than us—any one—should you harm, o possessor of the stone—(anyone) who (himself) intends harm, o possessor of the stone’. Geldner (1951–1957: I, 181) probably translates *cid* as ‘himself’ (‘selbst’) but I follow Jamison & Brereton, who write the intensifier in brackets, because this reading seems to be evoked by the two forms of *riṣ-* ‘harm’ rather than the presence of *cid*. Velankar (1951: 19) translates *cid* as a beyond-operator but this seems implausible because it is actually more likely that Indra destroys the hostile chariot when it is trying to injure the poet and his associates because then it is most urgent.⁴⁵ I assume that the clue to the interpretation of *cid* lies in the form *rīriṣantaṃ* ‘intending to harm’. This is a participle of a desiderative. Hence, it does not appear like an unlikely alternative in the presence of the non-desiderative form *ririṣes* ‘you should harm’. Rather, I assume this to be a case of scale-reversal and therefore render *cid* as ‘so much as’ in the translation. Such an interpretation of *cid* is also compatible with the translation by Jamison & Brereton.⁴⁶

With respect to beneath-operators, Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 19–21) identify three subclasses along the parameter of polarity: The first subclass consists of those beneath-operators that occur independently of polarity. The second subclass consists of those that can occur only in negated clauses. The third one consists of those that can occur only in non-negated clauses. That *cid* in the function of a beneath-operator can occur in clauses without negation can be seen in ex. (56) and (57) above so that it cannot be of the second type. Ex. (58) possibly shows the employment of *cid* as a beneath-operator in a negative clause:

⁴³ The translation is based on Geldner (1951–1957: I, 181) but does not follow him strictly: ‘Jeden Wagen, du Unsterblicher – jedweden anderen außer uns(eren) sollst du schädigen, du Herr des Preßsteins, der selbst (uns) zu Schaden trachtet, Herr des Preßsteins’.

⁴⁴ He translates *pādas f/g* as ‘A tout autre que nous, Ô Adrivas, tu dois nuire, à quiconque qui **tente de/entreprend/convoite de** (nous) **nuire**, Ô Adrivas’ (his boldface type).

⁴⁵ Velankar translates: ‘may you destroy any chariot whatsoever which is different from ours, even when it is about to injure us’.

⁴⁶ With the translation of Jamison & Brereton (2014) it would also be possible to assign *cid* the otherwise rare function of a particularizer: ‘Another one than us—any one—should you harm, o possessor of the stone—(anyone), especially one who (himself) intends harm, o possessor of the stone’.

(58) *ná* *te* *dūré* *paramá* *cid*
 NEG 2SG.DAT distance:LOC.SG.N farthest:NOM.PL.N PRT

rájāmsi
 dim.space:NOM.PL.N

‘Not **even** the farthest dusky realms are at a distance for you.’⁴⁷ RV 3.30.2a

As I have already mentioned and will outline in Section 4.10, I cannot be certain whether the linear order of the negation and *cid* can be regarded as indicating their scope. Under the assumption that linear order is in fact an indicator and *ná* takes wide scope over *cid*, the latter particle can be subsumed under the first group of beneath-operators. Since *cid* occurs both as a beyond-operator and a beneath-operator, the latter in positive and possibly also in negative contexts, it can in the terminology of Gast & van der Auwera (2011, 2013) be classified as a universal scalar additive operator. Note that general additive operators like *cid* do not necessarily occur in all three contexts when they have scalar function. Gast & van der Auwera (2013: 125) observe that “the general additive operators [from their Transeurasian sample] are used in at least two contexts, i.e. in upward entailing contexts and with clausemate negation”. This may also speak for an interpretation of ex. (58) in which the negation takes wide scope over *cid*.

Among the class of beyond-operators, Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 21–23) establish a subclass they label extended beyond-operators. However, since *cid* as a scalar additive operator does not behave like a proper beyond-operator but like a universal scalar operator, like English *even*, it cannot fall under this subclass.

A further group that Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 23f.) distinguish is the group of scalar negators. These are characterized by univerbations of scalar operators and negators. These elements can co-occur with a negative polarity item, but they are also able to express negative polarity without an additional negator in the sentence as Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 23) illustrate by means of the following Modern Greek examples adopted from Giannakidou (2007: 43, 58):

- (59) a. I *Maria dhen efaje* ***oute (kan)*** *to* *pagoto*.
 the Maria didn’t eat even the ice cream
 ‘Maria didn’t even eat the ice cream.’
- b. ***Oute (kan)*** *ti* *Maria* *proskalese* *o* *pritanis*.
 even the Maria invited.3SG the Dean
 ‘Not even Maria did the dean invite.’

⁴⁷ The translation deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

The Vedic particle *cid* is neither etymologically related to a negation, nor have I found a text passage in which it expresses negative polarity without the presence of a negator. Consequently, *cid* is not a scalar negator.⁴⁸ However, Vedic does possess a scalar negator of the type described by Gast & van der Auwera, namely *caná*, which at least synchronically appears to consist of *ca* ‘and’ and the negative particle *ná*, although its etymology is probably different (Mayrhofer 1992–2001: I, 528).⁴⁹ Its employment is illustrated in exx. (60) and (61):

(60) *ápas* *caná* *prá* *minanti* *vratám* *vām*
 water:NOM.PL.F PRT LP diminish:3PL commandment:ACC.SG.N 2DU.GEN

‘**Even** the waters **do not** confound your commandment.’ RV 2.24.12b

(61) *índram* *ná* *mahná* *pṛthivī* *caná* *práti*
 Indra:ACC.SG.M NEG greatness:INS.SG.M earth:NOM.SG.F PRT LP

‘**not even** the earth is the counterpart to Indra in greatness.’ RV 1.55.1b

As the comparison between these examples shows, Vedic *caná* can occur with or without the negative particle *ná* (cf. Grassmann 1873: 434f.). On the employment of *caná* see also Delbrück (1888: 544f.), Channing (1889), Macdonell (1916: 229f.), Hauri (1963: 89–92), Klein (1985b: 285–292), Viti (2007: 188–190), Briceño Villalobos (2019: 145–149) and Jeffcott & Neeson (2024).⁵⁰ Interestingly, *caná* is also used in positive polarity (Delbrück 1888: 544):

(62) *ahám* *caná* *tát* *sūribhir* *ānaśyām* /
 1SG.NOM PRT DEM:ACC.SG.N patron:INS.PL.M reach:PERF.OPT.1SG
táva *jyáya* *indara* *sumnám*
 2SG.GEN greater:ACC.SG.N Indra:VOC.SG.M favor:ACC.SG.N
ójah
 might:ACC.SG.N

‘Might I **also**, together with my patrons, attain this, the greater favor and might that are yours, Indra’ RV 6.26.7ab

The other instance of this sort that Delbrück (1888: 544) mentions is RV 1.55.5.⁵¹ The last class of additive operators that Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 24f.) present is a superclass of those that have already been discussed, namely the class of general additive operators. Under this label they subsume elements like Latin *et* and Ancient Greek *καί*, which can be used both as non-scalar additives (i.e. like English *also*) and as scalar additive operators (i.e. like English

⁴⁸ Note, however, that the collocation *nú cid* (lit. ‘even now’) may have the meaning ‘never’ (Section 4.3.2).

⁴⁹ In the Sāmaveda, *caná* is transmitted as *ca ná*, which Klein (1985b: 292) considers to be a folk etymology. Notice that *ca* is a cognate of *°te* in Modern Greek *oute*.

⁵⁰ Gonda (1957: 68–73) and Renou (1959: 44) assume that *ca* and *ná* are not univerbated, but Klein (1985b: 285–292) rejects this view.

⁵¹ In her commentary on ex. (62), Jamison (comm.VI.1: ad loc.) surmises that there are more than two instances of positive *caná*.

even). As I have already shown in the beginning of this section, *cid* is such a general additive operator.

This leads to the following interim summary: According to the classification established by Gast & van der Auwera (2011, 2013), the Vedic particle *cid* can be described as a general additive operator. It occurs both in the function of a non-scalar additive and of a scalar additive, although attestations where it clearly functions as a simple additive are relatively rare. In its function as a scalar operator, it occurs both as a beyond-operator and as a beneath-operator. In the latter function, it can be used both in positive and in negative clauses. Vedic *cid* is neither a scalar negator, unlike *caná*, nor an extended beyond-operator.

An important factor in the interpretation of a focus particle is the identification of its focus. This is often difficult because special prosodic features of the focus, which may have been present in Rigvedic times, are not indicated in the text (cf. Lühr 2018b: 183f.). Nonetheless, it has been observed in the literature, e.g. by Grassmann (1873: 454), that *cid* follows the word it emphasizes, i.e. its focus. However, Grassmann also observes that the focus of *cid* may contain more than one word, in which case *cid* occurs after the first of these words. This is illustrated by the following two examples, in both of which *cid* follows an attributive genitive:

(63)	<i>pitús</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>úddhar</i>	<i>janúṣā</i>	<i>viveda</i>
	father:GEN.SG.M	PRT	udder:ACC.SG.N	birth:INS.SG.N	find:PERF.3SG

‘At his birth, he found the udder **even** of his father.’ RV 3.1.9a

(64)	<i>divás</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>rocanád</i>	<i>ádhi</i>	/
	heaven:GEN.SG.M	PRT	luminous.realm:ABL.SG.N	LP	
	<i>á</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>gantam</i>	<i>suvarvidā</i>	
	LP	1PL.ACC	go:AOR.IMP.2DU	finding.sun:VOC.DU.M	

‘Come here to us **even** from the luminous realm of heaven, o finders of the sun’ RV 8.8.7ab

The first example is concerned with the birth of Agni. As it is normal for young animals to find the udder of their mother, I assume that the focus of *cid* is only *pitús* ‘of the father’, which is also reflected by the English syntax in Jamison & Brereton’s (2014: 467) translation.⁵² In contrast, the context of the second example suggests that the luminous realm of heaven is probably not intended as an alternative to other luminous realms. Rather, the entire nominal expression is an alternative to other places from which the Aśvins are asked to come here. Since there is no syntactic difference between exx. (63) and (64), this means that, as in English, Vedic

⁵² Unfortunately, it is not clear to what ‘the udder of his father’ refers (Jamison comm.III: ad loc.).

clauses can be ambiguous with respect to their focus. In the following passage, two coordinated nominals are within the focus of *cid*:

- (65) *dyāvā* *cid* *asmai* *pṛthivī*
 heaven:NOM.DU.M PRT DEM:DAT.SG.M earth:NOM.DU.F
namete
 bow:MID.3DU

‘**Even** heaven and earth bow to him’ RV 2.12.13a

For examples in which the whole clause is the focus of *cid* see Section 4.2. In addition to clauses with one focus, *cid* is also found in clauses with multiple foci, as in the following passage:

- (66) *yó* *jātám* *asya* *maható*
 REL:NOM.SG.M birth:ACC.SG.N DEM:GEN.SG.M great:GEN.SG.M
máhi *brávat* / *séd [= sá íd]* *u*
 great:ACC.SG.N speak:SBJV.3SG DEM:NOM.SG.M+PRT PRT
śrávobhir *yújiyaṃ* *cid* *abhy* *àsat*
 renown:INS.PL.N yokemate:ACC.SG.M PRT LP be:SBJV.3SG

‘who will speak of his birth, the great birth of the great one, just he will surpass in renown **even** his yokefellow.’ RV 1.156.2cd

In this passage, *cid* is not the only focus particle that occurs in the main clause. The particle *íd*, in combination with *u*, is probably used here to emphasize the identity of the demonstrative ‘sa’ with the subject of the preceding relative clauses.⁵³

The examples given thus far in this section illustrate the correctness of Grassmann’s (1873: 454) observations regarding the position of *cid* with respect to its focus. Nevertheless, there are passages in which *cid* seems to behave differently. The first counterexample concerns the position of *cid* when the focus is larger than one word:

- (67) *ṛbhúr* *vāja* *ṛbhukṣāḥ* *patyate*
 Ṛbhu:NOM.SG.M Vāja:NOM.SG.M Ṛbhukṣa:NOM.SG.M master:MID.3SG
śávo / *áva* *kṣṇaumi* *dāsasya*
 strength:ACC.SG.N LP whet:1SG Dāsa:GEN.SG.M
nāma *cit*
 name:ACC.SG.N PRT

‘As Ṛbhu, Vāja, Ṛbhukṣa [=the three Ṛbhus] he masters his strength, (saying,) “I whet down **even** the name of the Dāsa.”’ RV 10.23.2cd

Here *dāsasya nāma* ‘the name of the Dāsa’ is a complex nominal expression and it constitutes the focus. However, *cid* appears at the end of it. Note that it is difficult to give numbers for such deviations because in the Rigveda it is often difficult or impossible to determine whether a group of words forms a complex expression or not (cf. Kobayashi 2016; Coenen & Frotscher

⁵³ For reasons of space I have only given the last relative clause in the example.

2020). In this example, it might also be possible to assume that the entire pāda d constitutes the focus of *cid* (‘I even whet down the name of the Dāsa’), but in this interpretation the position of *cid* would be just as unexpected. In the following example, it appears that *cid* does not follow but precedes its focus:

(68) <i>suparṇá</i> eagle:NOM.SG.M	<i>itthā</i> so	<i>nakhám</i> talon:ACC.SG.M	<i>ā</i> LP	<i>siṣāya</i> bind:PERF.3SG	/
<i>ávaruddhah</i> LP.restrain:PPP.NOM.SG.M		<i>paripádaṃ</i> snare:ACC.SG.F	<i>ná</i> like	<i>siṃháh</i> lion:NOM.SG.M	/
<i>niruddhás</i> LP.restrain:PPP.NOM.SG.M		<i>cīn</i> PRT	<i>mahiśás</i> buffalo:NOM.SG.M	<i>tarṣiyāvān</i> thirsty:NOM.SG.M	/
<i>godhā</i> monitor.lizard:NOM.SG.F		<i>tásmā</i> DEM:DAT.SG.M	<i>ayáthaṃ</i> way:ACC.SG.N	<i>karṣad</i> plow:INJ.3SG	
<i>etát</i> DEM:ACC.SG.N					

‘The eagle caught its talon just so, like a lion entrapped into a snare. The buffalo **also** got trapped, when it was thirsty. The monitor-lizard plowed this way for him.’ RV 10.28.10

The first hemistich is about a falcon that got trapped like a lion. The next pāda is about another animal that got trapped, namely the buffalo (see Jamison comm.X.1: ad loc.). This suggests that the focus of *cid* in pāda c is *mahiśás* ‘the buffalo’, whose alternatives are the other animals that are trapped. This is supported by the fact that the participle *ruddhás* ‘restrained’, albeit with different local particles, is found in both clauses. Nonetheless, *cid* occurs after *niruddhás* ‘trapped’, which seems an unlikely candidate for being the focus, given the overall interpretation that is reflected in the translation of the example.⁵⁴ One possibility one might think of is that there is narrow focus on the local particle *ni-ruddhás* as opposed to *áva-ruddhas* and that *cid* marks a contrast between them (see Section 4.8).⁵⁵ However, I am not sure why special emphasis should be given to the contrast between the different preverbs in this context. Since the interpretation of passages like this is often difficult, it is also difficult to provide numbers for cases of this type because. As I have explained in Section 3, my analyses will always be based on the assumption that *cid* is associated with the preceding word, or the preceding word and others. Only if it is not possible to determine the function of *cid* in this way

⁵⁴ Schnaus (2008: 218–220) offers a different interpretation of the stanza. She assigns an agentive meaning to the predicate *ā siṣāya* in pāda a, assuming that the eagle holds the lion with its talon (see also Pischel 1897: 90). She translates: ‘Der Adler hat derart die Krallen herumgeschlungen, festgehalten wie in einer Falle (ist) der Löwe. **niedergehalten** [sic] (ist) der Büffel, durstig, die Echse zerrte ihm so den Fuß’. In such a context, *mahiśás* is still the most likely candidate for being in focus. The difference here is that only the lion constitutes an alternative while the eagle does not.

⁵⁵ Notice that for some reason the preverb in *niruddhás* is unaccented (Jamison comm.X.1: ad loc.), but I do not know whether there is a connection with the function of *cid*.

will I contemplate the possibility that its focus might follow the particle. A particularly interesting case regarding the position of *cid* with respect to its focus is the following passage:

(69)	<i>śúnaś</i> dog:GEN.SG.M	<i>cid</i> PRT	<i>chépaṃ</i> tail:ACC.SG.M	<i>níditaṃ</i> LP.bind:PPP.ACC.SG.M
	<i>sahásrād</i> thousand:ABL.SG.N	/	<i>yúpād</i> post:ABL.SG.M	<i>amuñco</i> release:IPRF.2SG
	<i>ásamiṣṭa</i> exhaust:AOR.MID.3SG	<i>hí</i> for	<i>śáh</i> DEM:NOM.SG.M	/ <i>evásmád [= evá asmád]</i> so+1PL.ABL
	<i>agne</i> Agni:VOC.SG.M	<i>ví</i> LP	<i>mumugdhi</i> release:PERF.IMP.2SG	<i>pāśān</i> fetter:ACC.PL.M
	<i>hótaś</i> Hotar:VOC.SG.M	<i>cikitva</i> perceive:PTCP.PERF.ACT.VOC.SG.M	<i>ihá</i> here	<i>tú</i> PRT
	<i>niśádyá</i> LP.sit:CVB			

‘You loosed **even** Śunaḥśepa, who was bound, from his thousand (bonds), from the sacrificial post, since he exhausted himself (in sacrifice). So unloose the fetters from us, o Agni, watchful Hotar, after having taken your seat here.’ RV 5.2.7ab

In this passage, the focus of *cid* contains the proper name *śúnaś-śépa-*, which is a compound and literally means ‘dog-tailed’ (Monier-Williams 1899: 1082). Peculiarly, *cid* does not occur after this compound but between its two members. In the following example, I consider *cid* to be associated with a complex focus:

(70)	<i>ájre</i> plain:LOC.SG.M	<i>cid</i> PRT	<i>asmai</i> DEM:DAT.SG.M	<i>kṛṇuthā</i> do:2PL	<i>niáñcanaṃ</i> niche:ACC.SG.N	/
	<i>durgé</i> difficult.to.pass:LOC.SG.N	<i>cid</i> PRT	<i>á</i> PRT	<i>susaraṇám</i> easy.progress:ACC.SG.N	/ <i>eṣá</i> DEM:NOM.SG.F	
	<i>cid</i> PRT	<i>asmād</i> DEM:ABL.SG.M	<i>aśániḥ</i> missile:NOM.SG.F	<i>paró</i> far	<i>nú</i> now	<i>śá</i> DEM:NOM.SG.F
	<i>ásredhantī</i> NEG.err:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.F	<i>ví</i> LP	<i>naśyatu</i> disappear:IMP.3SG			

‘**Even** in the flat plain you make a niche for him; **even** in difficult going (you make for him) smooth flowing. **Also** this missile—it is now far from him—let it go unfaltering to destruction.’ RV 8.27.18

Here, pādas a and b evoke two sets of alternatives each. Thus, one can assign the following stress pattern to their translation: ‘Even IN THE FLAT PLAIN you make A NICHE for him; even IN DIFFICULT GOING (you make for him) SMOOTH FLOWING’. Two further things are noteworthy here. First, the second *cid* co-occurs with *á*, which is possibly also used as an emphatic particle here (Kuiper 1973: 201, RIVELEX II, 25). Second, the interpretation of the third *cid* appears to be different from the first two (Jamison comm.VIII.1: ad loc.). Pādas c/d express a request and pādas a and b justify why the fulfillment of this request is to be expected. Pādas a and b

state that the gods help a man even when the circumstances are particularly unfavorable. Pādas c/d then add another scenario in which the gods should help him, i.e. the focus is the entire clause. Compared to what is described in the first hemistich, it does not seem unlikely anymore that the gods will help him. Hence, *cid* is used in a non-scalar context here. I consider such an interpretation very plausible, although Jamison (comm.VIII.1: ad loc.) does not seem to be satisfied by an additive interpretation of *cid* here.

According to Forker (2016: 72), the relevant alternatives of the focus of additives usually have been mentioned before or are inferable from the preceding discourse. Boley (2004: 151) observes that Vedic *cid* also exhibits this behavior, but that the alternatives of its focus may also occur only later in the discourse. One case in which the alternatives are mentioned in a previous clause is ex. (33), where the gharma pot is added to the livestock, which has been mentioned before. In ex. (69), the alternative *asmád* ‘from us’ is mentioned in the following clause. Agni is asked to save us like he saved Śunaḥśepa. Notice that the alternatives do not have to fulfill the same syntactic role in both clauses. Note furthermore that I do not intend to say that the referents of the first person plural have not been mentioned before in this hymn. What I mean is that they do not appear as alternatives to Śunaḥśepa.

The following case is interesting because here the alternative to the focus of *cid* is mentioned as many as five stanzas earlier. For reasons of space, I only gloss the relevant pādas:

(71) *sá* *jātébhir* *vṛtrahā*
 DEM:NOM.SG.M be.born:PPP.INS.PL.M Vṛtra.smasher:NOM.SG.M

séd *u* *havyaír* / *úd*
 DEM:NOM.SG.M+PRT PRT oblation:INS.PL.N LP

usríyā *asṛjad* *índro* *arkaíḥ* /
 ruddy:ACC.PL.F send:IPRF.3SG Indra:NOM.SG.M chant:INS.PL.M

*urūcí asmai ghṛtávad bhárantī / mádhu svádma duduhe jéniyā gauḥ // pítaré cic cakruḥ
 sádanam sám asmai / máhi tvíṣīmat sukṛto ví hí khyán / viṣkabhnánta skámbhanenā
 jánitri / áśīnā úrdhvám rabhasám ví minvan // mahí yádi dhiśáṇā śiśnáthe dhāt /
 sadyovṛdham vibhúvam ródasīyoḥ / gíro yásminn anavadyāḥ samīcīr / vísvā índrāya
 táviṣīr ánuttāḥ // máhi á te sakhiyám vaśmi śaktīr / á vṛtraghné niyúto yanti pūrviḥ / máhi
 stotrám áva áganma sūrér / asmákaṃ sú maghavan bodhi gopāḥ // máhi kṣétram purú
 ścandrám vividván / ád ít sákhibhyaś carátham sám airat / índro nṛbhir ajanad dídiyānaḥ
 / sákam súryam uśásam gātúm agním*

apás *cid* *eśá* *vibhúvo*
 water:ACC.PL.F PRT DEM:NOM.SG.M abundant:ACC.PL.F

dámūnāḥ / *prá* *sadhrīcīr* *asṛjad*
 master.of.house:NOM.SG.M LP converging:ACC.PL.F send:IPRF.3SG

viśváścandrāḥ
 all.gleaming:ACC.PL.F

‘He was Vṛtra-smasher with (the help of) those who were born (together) [=Maruts], and he sent the ruddy (cows) surging upward with oblations and with the chants (of the Aṅgirasas)—he is Indra. She of broad extent, bearing ghee-rich (milk) to him, milked out honey, sweetness—the thoroughbred cow.

12. It was for the father that they performed a ritual Session, for him also they prepared a seat, because the good workers surveyed the great, turbulent (cowpen). Propping apart with a prop the two begetters [=Heaven and Earth], while sitting (the Session) they fixed upright the dazzling (seat).

13. When the great (Earth), the Holy Place, has set him to piercing—him who is grown strong in a single day, spread wide in the two world-halves, and in whom the flawless hymns are united—(then) all powers are conceded to Indra.

14. Great is your comradeship—I long for it here, and for your powers. Numerous teams [=our poetic thoughts] come here to the Vṛtra-smasher. Great is the praise song. We have arrived at the favor of the patron [=Indra]. For us, liberal one, become a protector of cows.

15. Great the dwelling place, abundant the gleaming (goods) that he found; thereupon he assembled movable (goods [=livestock]) for his comrades. Indra along with the men, as shining one, begot at one blow the sun, the dawn, the way, the fire.

16. **Also** the all-gleaming waters, spread wide, did this master of the house send surging forth toward a single goal.’ RV 3.31.11–16b

Jamison (comm.III: ad loc.) explains that *cid* “links this [stanza] with a previous part of the hymn, namely 11b where Indra sends surging another group of fem. entities”. This means that *usrīyās* ‘ruddy (cows)’ in pāda 11b is the overt alternative to *apās* ‘waters’ in pāda 16a even though four stanzas occur between them. In addition to these cases in which the alternatives of the focus of *cid* are mentioned before or afterwards in the hymn, it is also possible that they are not mentioned at all. One such case is ex. (39) above.

According to Forker (2016: 72), the focus of an additive particle may have been mentioned in the previous discourse but this need not be the case. In the following example, the focus has been mentioned immediately before:

(72)	<i>ā</i>	<i>ródasī</i>		<i>apṛṇā</i>	<i>jāyamāna</i>	/
	LP	world.halves:ACC.DU.F		fill:IPRF.2SG	be.born:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M	
	<i>utá</i>	<i>prá rikthā</i>		<i>ádha nú</i>	<i>prayajyo</i>	/
	and	LP	leave:AOR.INJ.2SG	then now	worshipful:VOC.SG.M	
	<i>divás</i>		<i>cid</i>	<i>agne</i>	<i>mahinā</i>	
	heaven:ABL.SG.M		PRT	Agni:VOC.SG.M	greatness:INS.SG.M	
	<i>pr̥thivyá</i>					
	earth:ABL.SG.F					

‘You filled the two world-halves as you were born, and now you, o you who seek the first offerings, have surpassed **even** the heaven and the earth by your greatness, o Agni.’ RV 3.6.2a–c

The word *ródasī* ‘the two world-halves’ refers to heaven and earth. In the following clause, *cid* is associated with *divás pr̥thivyá* ‘heaven and earth’. Notice that the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 477) appears unintuitive because it is *prá rikthā* ‘you have surpassed’ which is

a more unlikely alternative to *ā apr̥ṇā* ‘you filled’ and should be considered the focus of the second clause.⁵⁶ Thus, with Ludwig (1876–1888: I, 333), Griffith (1896–1897: I, 324), Oldenberg (1897: 244) and Hoffmann (1967: 270) I assume a clause boundary after pāda b. Whereas Ludwig, Oldenberg and Griffith construe pāda c together with d I interpret c to be a separate elliptic clause. I therefore suggest the following translation: ‘You filled the two world-halves as you were born, and now you, o you who seek the first offerings, have surpassed them. You (have surpassed) even heaven and earth by your greatness’. This does not constitute a strong deviation from the translation by Jamison & Brereton but it makes the use of *cid* more plausible. Pādas a and b describe the increase of Agni’s greatness from his birth to now. In pāda c the poet then stops to realize what a marvelous fact he has just described, namely that Agni surpasses something as great as heaven and earth. In the next example, the focus of *cid* is a proper part of a referent that has been mentioned immediately before:

(73)	<i>ā</i>	<i>ródasī</i>		<i>vṛṣabhó</i>		<i>roravīti</i>	/
	LP	world.halves:ACC.DU.F		bull:NOM.SG.M		roar:INT.3SG	
	<i>divás</i>		<i>cid</i>	<i>ántām̐</i>		<i>upamām̐</i>	<i>úd</i>
	heaven:GEN.SG.M		PRT	end:ACC.PL.M		farthest:ACC.PL.M	LP
	<i>ānal</i>						
	reach:AOR.3SG						

‘the bull keeps bellowing to the two world-halves. He has reached up **even** to the farthest ends of heaven’ RV 10.8.1bc

Again, the word *ródasī* ‘the two world-halves’ refers to heaven and earth. In the immediately following clause, I assume that the focus of *cid* comprises the nominal expression *divás ántān upamām̐* ‘the farthest ends of heaven’, which are a proper part of the two world-halves. The next example shows a case where the referent has not been mentioned before in the hymn:

(74)	<i>dāsasya</i>		<i>cid</i>	<i>vṛṣaśiprāsya</i>		<i>māyā</i>	/
	Dāsa:GEN.SG.M		PRT	Vṛṣaśipra:GEN.SG.M		macigal.wile:ACC.PL.F	
	<i>jaghnáthur</i>	<i>narā</i>		<i>pṛtanājiyeṣu</i>			
	hit:PERF.2DU	man:VOC.DU.M		battle.drive:LOC.PL.N			

‘The magical wiles **even** of the Dāsa Vṛṣaśipra did you smite in the battle drives, you two superior men.’ RV 7.99.4cd

The translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1009) suggests that there is narrow focus on the name *dāsasya vṛṣaśiprāsya*, which has not been mentioned in the preceding stanzas of the hymn, but even if the complex expression *dāsasya vṛṣaśiprāsya māyā* were in focus, the same would hold true.

⁵⁶ See Renou (1955–1969: XII, 55) for similar syntactic boundaries but a different interpretation of *cid*: ‘Tu as emplí les Deux Mondes en naissant et tu as débordé encore, ô (dieu) qui sacrifies en avant, / le Ciel lui-même et la Terre par ta grandeur, ô Agni’.

In her typological study of additive operators, Forker (2016) also finds that these elements are regularly employed for other purposes that deviate from the core additive function. If these functions are attested for Vedic *cid*, I have dedicated a section to them but there are others which I have not identified. In half of the languages that Forker (2016: 74–77) examines in her typology, she finds that additives are used to mark contrastive topics (cf. Krifka 1998) or topic switch. Moreover, she found languages in which additives function as adversative connectors. I have not identified such functions of *cid* in the Rigveda.⁵⁷

In this section I have investigated the functions of *cid* as an additive particle and the contexts in which it occurs. I have demonstrated that Vedic *cid* is a general additive operator because it has a scalar and non-scalar use. It occurs in positive and probably also in negative polarity, both in scale-preserving and in scale-reversing contexts. There appear to be no restrictions as to which lexical classes and syntactic categories can appear as its focus. Both the alternatives of the focus and the focus itself can be mentioned in the previous part of the hymn, in the following part or not at all. The Rigveda exhibits neither clear cases of *cid* marking contrastive topics or topic switch nor cases of *cid* as an adversative marker.

4.2 Multiple occurrences of *cid* and its use as a discourse marker

In the previous section, I have examined the functions of *cid* as an additive particle. In order to do so, I have primarily discussed passages which contain one instance of *cid*. There are, however, also passages which contain two or more instances of *cid* in close proximity to each other. Whereas Grassmann (1873: 455) explains that in these cases the function equals single *cid*, other dictionaries and grammars have assigned them translations that differ from the usual additive function. Monier-Williams (1899: 398) renders it as ‘as well as, both—and’, which matches Böhtlingk & Roth’s (1855–1875: II, 1026) ‘sowohl — als auch’. Renou (1952: 376) translates it as ‘not only ... but also’ (‘non seulement...mais encore’). Viti (2007: 44) regards both of these as possible translations and assumes that double *cid* encodes connection. This section is dedicated to such cases of multiple *cid*. I will attempt to determine the different functions that a multiple employment of *cid* has, both within one clause and in subsequent clauses. Moreover, I will also discuss the alleged emphatically coordinating constructions *cid* ... *ca* and *cid* ... *u* and a possible conjunctive value of single *cid*. With respect to a conjunctive or connective function of *cid*, I will also examine further cases of single *cid*. As the relation

⁵⁷ One passage where *cid* might be associated with a contrastive topic is ex. (97) in Section 4.2, but this passage is highly problematic.

between two or more instances of *cid* is not always clear, I will continue providing only a qualitative analysis and not give any numbers.

The first group of cases that I discuss here are actually not cases of multiple *cid*. The instances of *cid* are associated with elements that are independent of each other, i.e. they cannot be located on the same (implicit) scale. Consider the following example:

(75)	<i>ā́d</i>	<i>áha</i>	<i>svadhám</i>		<i>ánu</i>	/	<i>púnar</i>	
	then	PRT	own.nature:ACC.SG.F		LP		again	
	<i>garbhatvám</i>		<i>eriré</i>		<i>dádhānā</i>			
	embryonic.state:ACC.SG.N		rouse:PERF.MID.3PL		acquire:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.PL.M			
	<i>nā́ma</i>		<i>yajñtyam</i>		//			
	name:ACC.SG.N		worthy.of.sacrifice:ACC.SG.N					
	<i>vī́lú</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>ārujatnúbhir</i>	/	<i>gúhā</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>indra</i>	
	firm:ACC.SG.N	PRT	breaking:INS.PL.M		in.hiding	PRT	Indra:VOC.SG.M	
	<i>váhnibhiḥ</i>		/	<i>ávinda</i>	<i>usríyā</i>		<i>ánu</i>	
	conveyor:INS.PL.M			find:IPRF.2SG	ruddy:ACC.PL.F		LP	

‘4. Certainly, just after that they once again roused his embryonic state [=kindled the fire] according to his nature, acquiring for themselves a name worthy of the sacrifice.

5. Along with the (ritual-)conveyors [=Aṅgirasas] who break **even** the stronghold, o Indra, you discovered the ruddy (cattle) **even** in the hiding place.’ RV 1.6.4f.⁵⁸

In this example, the two occurrences of *cid* function independently of each other. The scope of the first *cid* is the nominal expression *vī́lú ... ārujatnúbhis ... váhnibhis* ‘with the conveyors who break the stronghold’. It locates *vī́lú* high on a scale of entities which can be broken. In contrast, the scope of the second *cid* is the entire clause.⁵⁹ Its focus is the adverbial case form *gúhā* ‘in the hiding place’, which is located on a scale of entities that can be found. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 96) interpret the second *cid* somewhat differently. They translate “you discovered the ruddy (cattle) even though in hiding”. This means that they regard *cid* as conveying concessive meaning (cf. Section 4.6). In any case, the two occurrences of *cid* in ex. (75) are not related to the same scale of possible alternatives. In the following case, the expressions that are the foci of *cid* cannot be regarded as alternatives either, because they are coreferential:

(76)	<i>nāvagvāsaḥ</i>	<i>sutásomāsa</i>	<i>índraṃ</i>	/	<i>dásagvāso</i>	<i>abhí arcanti</i>	<i>arkaiḥ</i>	/
	<i>gávyam</i>		<i>cid</i>	<i>ūrvám</i>		<i>apidhānavantaṃ</i>		/
	bovine:ACC.SG.M		PRT	pen:ACC.SG.M		with.cover:ACC.SG.M		

⁵⁸ The translation of stanza 5 deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

⁵⁹ As is suggested in the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 96), the expression *vī́lú cid ārujatnúbhis ... váhnibhis* might be outside the scope of the second *cid*. The example might be understood as ‘Alone, you found the cattle on the pasture but along with the (ritual-)conveyors who break even the stronghold, you found the cattle even in the hiding place’. The previous stanza does not clearly point to one of the alternative interpretations.

‘Just as there are many hymns that exist for you, Indra, and many are (the deeds) you have done for the cow, when fighting over the meadows, (and many [the paths]?) you carved out **also** for the sun in your [his] own home, as bull you (have carved out) **even** the names of the Dāsa in the contests.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 699)⁶¹

‘... **Even** for the sun in his own home the bull pruned **even** the name of the Dāsa in the contests.’⁶² RV 5.33.4

This stanza is in general very difficult to interpret (see the extensive discussion by Jamison comm.V: ad loc.). As the translations given in the examples show, it is not clear whether this is a case of double *cid* because it is unclear whether the second hemistich consists of one single clause or whether pādas c and d each contain one separate clause. The translations by Kümmel (2000: 207) and Witzel et al. (2013: 258) reflect the former interpretation whereas the one by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 699) reflects the latter one.⁶³ Geldner (1951–1957: II, 32) appears to be indecisive but due to the presence of double *cid*, he opts for an interpretation as two separate clauses in his translation.⁶⁴ For metrical reasons, Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 330) even questions the very presence of the final *cid* in pāda d, referring to Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 575). Grassmann even wants to delete both instances of *cid*, which Oldenberg finds unnecessary. Particularly interesting for the semantic analysis of the particle are cases in which scalar *cid* appears with each of two coordinated expressions within one clause:

(79) *trír ā diváh savitā soṣavīti / rājānā mitrāvāruṇā supāñī /*

<i>āpas</i> water:NOM.PL.F	<i>cid</i> PRT	<i>asya</i> DEM:GEN.SG.M	<i>ródasī</i> world.halves:NOM.DU.F	<i>cid</i> PRT
<i>urvī</i> broad:NOM.DU.F	/	<i>rátanam</i> treasure:ACC.SG.N	<i>bhikṣanta</i> apportion:DES.INJ.MID.3PL	
<i>savitúḥ</i> Savitar:GEN.SG.M		<i>savāya</i> impulse:DAT.SG.M		

‘Three times a day Savitar keeps impelling (and?) the two kings, Mitra and Varuṇa, of good hands. **Even** the waters, **even** the two broad world-halves beg for his treasure, for Savitar to impel it.’ RV 3.56.7

Here, both *āpas* ‘the waters’ and *ródasī urvī* ‘the broad world-halves are located on a scale of entities that beg for Savitar’s treasure.’⁶⁵ The context suggests that *cid* marks those two entities

⁶¹ On the interpretation of *tataksé* as 2SG see Jamison (comm.V: ad loc.).

⁶² The translation is based on Kümmel (2000: 207) and Witzel et al. (2013: 258): ‘**Zurechtgezimmert hat** auch für Sūrya an seinem eigenen Wohnort der Stier in den Kämpfen sogar des Dāsa Namen’; ‘Es hat sogar für die Sonne in der ihr eigenen Domäne der Bulle auch noch den Namen des Dāsa in Kämpfen zurechtgestutzt’.

⁶³ Notice that Kümmel and Witzel et al. each translate only one instance of *cid* as the scalar additive particle ‘sogar’ and the other one as the general additive particle ‘auch’ or ‘auch noch’, respectively.

⁶⁴ ‘Er beschnitt sogar der Sonne (ihren Namen) im eigenen Hause, in den Kämpfen (beschnitt) der Bulle auch des Dāsa Namen’.

⁶⁵ Geldner (1951–1957: I, 404) interprets also pāda b, *rājānā mitrāvāruṇā supāñī* ‘the two kings, Mitra and Varuṇa, of good hands’, as part of the scale. I follow Renou (1955–1969: V, 17) and Jamison & Brereton (2014: 547), among others, in assuming a clause boundary after pāda b.

as unlikely alternatives to beg for Savitar’s treasure. The second alternative seems to be even less likely than the first. In this regard, it is worth considering the difference between the scalar additive particles *incluso* and *hasta* in Spanish and *-bhii* and *-tak* in Hindi, respectively, in similar contexts. According to Schwenter & Vasisht (2000: 229f.), the particles *hasta* and *-tak* specifically mark the end point of a scale whereas *incluso* and *-bhii*, albeit scalar particles as well, do not. Compare the following Spanish examples:

(80) A: *¿Vino X a tu fiesta?*

'Did X come to your party?'

B: *No sólo X, **incluso** vino Y e **incluso** Z.*

'Not only X, INCLUSO Y came and INCLUSO Z came.' (Schwenter & Vasisht 2000: 229)

(81) A: *¿Vino X a tu fiesta?*

'Did X come to your party?'

B: *#No sólo X, **hasta** vino Y y **hasta** Z.*

'Not only X, HASTA Y came and HASTA Z came.' (Schwenter & Vasisht 2000: 229)

Schwenter & Vasisht (2000: 229f.) explain that in ex. (80), *incluso* is used “to ‘climb the scale’ of persons ranked by their unlikelihood of attending the party”. Thus, it can occur with more than one element of the same scale. Schwenter & Vasisht furthermore explain that due to “the scalar endpoint-marking value” that *hasta* possesses, it cannot occur with more than one element on the same scale, as ex. (81) shows. The fact that in ex. (79) *cid* occurs twice, with elements located on the same scale, shows that it does not behave like Spanish *hasta* or Hindi *-tak*. Rather, it appears to be employed to “climb the scale” like Spanish *incluso* and Hindi *-bhii* do according to Schwenter & Vasisht (2000: 229f.). This has implications for the semantic analysis of scalar *cid* in general. As I have already mentioned in the introduction to Section 4 and in 4.1, Lühr (2017: 284f. 2018b: 183) claims that *cid* “is a scalar focus particle assigning to its domain an extreme position on a scale formed by its contextually relevant alternatives”. Ex. (79), which is comparable to the Spanish ex. (80), shows that the position that the focus of scalar additive *cid* occupies on the scale need not be an extreme point, but *cid* can also be used to express that the position is relatively high. According to the terminology by Schwenter & Vasisht (2000), *cid* can thus be classified as a relative scalar particle.

The next example reveals another remarkable fact about the use of *cid*: When two occurrences of *cid* are associated with elements that are located on the same scale, they do not necessarily have to be located on similar places on this scale as in ex. (79) above. These two elements may also be opposites of each other, as ex. (82) shows:

(82) *ná dakṣiṇā ví cikite ná savyā / ná prācīnam ādityā nótá paścā /*

<i>pākyā</i> naiveté:INS.SG.F	<i>cid</i> PRT	<i>vasavo</i> good:VOC.PL.M	<i>dhīryā</i> wisdom:INS.SG.F	<i>cid</i> / PRT
<i>yusmānto</i> led.by.you:NOM.SG.M	<i>ābhayaṃ</i> without.fear:ACC.SG.N		<i> jyōtir</i> light:ACC.SG.N	
<i>aśyām</i> reach:AOR.OPT.1SG				

‘I see far neither to the right nor to the left, neither forward nor behind, Ādityas. **Be it** in naiveté **or** in wisdom, you good ones, led by you, might I attain the light free from fear.’
RV 2.27.11

The literal translation of pāda c is ‘also in naiveté, also in wisdom’ (cf. Grassmann 1873: 455). In this example, the double occurrence of *cid* is used to express a disjunction with a free-choice reading, hence the translation ‘be it in naiveté or in wisdom’ (cf. also Klein 2013: 144f.). The speaker wants to attain the light free from fear regardless of his mental capabilities. In order to express this, he gives a choice between two opposite points of the scale, which implies that also for intermediate points of the scale his request still holds. A similar interpretation is also suggested by Jamison (comm.II: ad loc.), although she seems somewhat surprised by the disjunctive interpretation that this context seems to require. From a typological perspective, the appearance of additives in such contexts is actually not too surprising (see Forker 2016: 78).⁶⁶

Another function that multiple additives express in many languages is emphatic coordination of the type *both X and Y* (Forker 2016: 82–84).⁶⁷ According to Böhlingk & Roth (1855–1875: II, 1026) and Viti (2007: 44), *cid ... cid* has exactly this function.⁶⁸ However, the above discussion has shown that ex. (79) and (82) are no instances of this type. Ex. (79) should be interpreted as an asyndetic conjunction. The primary function of *cid ... cid* in this sentence is to mark each conjunct as unlikely in the context rather than to emphasize that the predicate holds true for both of them (and not to only one of them). In ex. (82), *cid ... cid* expresses a free-choice disjunction, not a conjunction. There is, however, a text passage in which the interpretation of multiple *cid* as emphatic coordination is to me the most plausible one, viz. ex. (83):⁶⁹

(83) <i>prātarjītam</i> early.victorious:ACC.SG.M	<i>bhāgam</i> Bhaga:ACC.SG.M	<i>ugrām</i> strong:ACC.SG.M
------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

⁶⁶ In his diachronic study on the Korean particle *-na*, Kim (2015) regards the employment in free-choice disjunctions as a step towards the employment as a focus particle meaning ‘even’ or ‘just’ (cf. Section 4.8). However, the Rigvedic data do not suggest such a path for the development of *cid*.

⁶⁷ For an overview of coordination in general see Haspelmath (2004).

⁶⁸ Böhlingk & Roth (1855–1875: II, 1026) render it as ‘both — and’ (‘sowohl — als auch’), Viti (2007: 44) renders it as ‘both ... and’ or ‘not only ... but also’.

⁶⁹ More rarely, two additives can also express non-emphatic coordination (Forker 2016: 83). I have not identified an instance of this kind in the Rigveda either.

<i>huvema</i> call:AOR.OPT.1PL	/	<i>vayám</i> 1PL.NOM	[...]/	<i>ādhrás</i> weak:NOM.SG.M	<i>cid</i> PRT	
<i>yám</i> REL:ACC.SG.M		<i>mányamānas</i> think:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M		<i>turás</i> strong:NOM.SG.M	<i>cid</i> PRT	/
<i>rājā</i> king:NOM.SG.M		<i>cid</i> PRT		<i>yám</i> REL:ACC.SG.M	<i>bhágam</i> portion:ACC.SG.M	
<i>bhakṣīti</i> apportion:IMP.2SG+QUOT				<i>āha</i> say:PERF.3SG		

‘We should call on the one victorious at early morning, Bhaga the strong, [...] to whom **both** a person who thinks himself weak **and** the powerful, **as well as** the king says “Apportion me a portion.”’⁷⁰ RV 7.41.2

Jamison & Brereton (2014: 936) translate pādas c and d as ‘to whom even a person who thinks himself weak (and also) even the powerful, even the king says “Apportion me a portion”’.⁷¹ Thus, they render all three instances of *cid* as ‘even’. However, I do not think that this translation is appropriate here. Pādas c and d contain three alternatives, i.e. three different types of people that demand a portion from Bhaga. These types of people can be ordered on a scale of social rank, which probably correlates with the unlikelihood of asking for a portion: *the weak one* < *the strong one* < *the king*, where the left element is the least unlikely to ask for a portion. As the weak one and the king are on different ends on this scale, it is not possible to regard both as unlikely alternatives. The same holds true for the strong one, because he appears to be in the middle of the other two alternatives. As a result, it is more likely to assume that the three instances of *cid* emphasize that the predicate of the sentence holds true for people of all social ranks that are mentioned here. It is important to mention here that there is no clear-cut difference between the use of additive particles and emphatic coordination. Thus, according to Hendriks (2004), English *both ... and* are each to be regarded as additive particles the focus of which are the expressions they conjoin. Forker (2016: 83f.) follows this analysis and applies it to all the cases of emphatic coordination she finds in her language sample.⁷² This analysis can also be applied to ex. (83), where ‘a person who thinks himself weak’, ‘the powerful’ and ‘the king’ are alternative values among the set of people who say ‘Apportion me a portion’. Notice furthermore the close semantic relationship between free-choice disjunction and emphatic coordination. However, ex. (83) is not an instance of a free-choice disjunction because it states

⁷⁰ The translation deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

⁷¹ On stylistics see Klein (2013: 146).

⁷² In her analysis of the additive particle *-mās* in the modern Iranian language Ishkashimi, Karvovskaya (2013: 84) states that in a construction *-mās ... -mās* “the first usage of *-mās* is not additive in the strict sense of the word. It is reminiscent of cataphora as it only corefers with the later *-mās* but does not have an additive meaning component on its own”.

the fact that for all three people it is true that they say ‘Apportion me a portion’.⁷³ A similar ambiguity like that between free-choice disjunction and emphatic coordination can be observed in the collocation *kād cid*, which can have the meaning of a free-choice indefinite ‘any’ and a universal quantifier ‘every’ (cf. Section 4.3.1). The following stanza dedicated to the Ásvins contains six instances of *cid*. Here, its additive and emphatically coordinating functions can be observed side by side:

(84)	<i>amājúras</i> aging.at.home:GEN.SG.F	<i>cid</i> PRT	<i>bhavatho</i> become:2DU	<i>yuvám</i> 2DU.NOM	<i>bhágo</i> fortune:NOM.SG.M	/
	<i>anāśós</i> slow:GEN.SG.M	<i>cid</i> PRT	<i>avitárāpamásya</i> [= <i>avitārā apamásya</i>] helper:NOM.DU.M+last:GEN.SG.M		<i>cit</i> PRT	/
	<i>andhásya</i> blind:GEN.SG.M	<i>cin</i> PRT	<i>nāsatiyā</i> Nāsatya:VOC.DU.M	<i>kṛśásya</i> starving:GEN.SG.M	<i>cid</i> PRT	/
	<i>yuvám</i> 2DU.ACC	<i>íd</i> PRT	<i>āhur</i> say:PERF.3PL	<i>bhiśájā</i> healer:ACC.DU.M	<i>rutásya</i> break:PPP.GEN.SG.M	<i>cit</i> PRT

‘You become good fortune **even** for the woman growing old at home, the helpers **even** of the one lacking speed, **even** of the one furthest behind. **Even** of the blind man, o Nāsatyas, **even** of the starving, **even** of the broken—they say just you are their healers.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1440)

‘You become good fortune **even** for the woman growing old at home, the helpers of **both** the one lacking speed—**even** of the one furthest behind—**and** of the blind man, **as well as** of the starving. They say just you are the healers **even** of the broken.’ (my adaptation) RV 10.39.3

Before beginning the discussion of *cid*, I need to comment briefly on the clause boundaries that I assume. I consider pāda a to be the first clause, pādas b/c the second and pāda d the third. The first clause contains one instance of *cid* and I consider it to be a fairly clear instance of its use as a scalar additive particle. The predicate of the second clause is the agent noun *avitārā* ‘helpers’, on which four genitives, i.e. different (groups of) people that are helped by the Ásvins, depend. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1440) translate all instances of *cid* as ‘even’. This may be possible but, in my opinion, *cid* is used to emphatically conjoin these genitives and thus to emphasize that the Ásvins help all of them. Yet, a closer look reveals that not all four of the genitives in this clause are to be treated equally. The second genitive *apamásya* ‘the one furthest behind’ constitutes a more unlikely alternative to the first one *ānāśós* ‘of the one lacking speed’ and is not simply a different group of people that the Ásvins help. Instead, it seems to be a parenthetical insertion. Therefore, I consider the second *cid* of the second clause to function as a scalar additive particle unlike the other three in this clause.⁷⁴ This slight difference in the relation of the four genitives supports my view that the first, third and fourth instance of *cid* are

⁷³ See, however, the translation by Dōyama & Gotō (2022: 213), who seem to assume a free-choice meaning.

⁷⁴ Cf. the translation of this pāda by Ludwig (1876–1888: I, 81): ‘helfer des nicht schnellen sogar des letzten’.

used for emphatic conjunction and only the second one is used as a scalar additive particle. Nevertheless, it is not compelling, for if one assumes a clause boundary after pāda b, which is supported by the fact that it would coincide with the hemistich boundary, the four genitives would not be conjoined nominal expressions in the same clause anyway. The last instance of *cid*, which occurs in pāda d, I regard as a scalar additive particle again.

According to Böhtlingk & Roth (1855–1875: II, 1026), Monier-Williams (1899: 398) and Viti (2007: 44), emphatic coordination can be expressed not only by *cid ... cid* but also by *cid ... ca* and *cid ... u*. *Ca* is a conjunction ‘and’ and *u* is a particle whose function it is to express “identity focus” (Klein 2016: 198) or to conjoin clauses (Klein 1985a: 54). Böhtlingk & Roth (1855–1875: II, 1026) give one example for *cid ... ca*, namely the following one:

(85) *áveṃám aśvaíd yuvatīḥ purástād / yuñkté gávām aruṇānām ánīkam / ví nūnām uchād ásati
prá ketúr / grhām-grham úpa tiṣṭhāte agníḥ //*

<i>út</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>váyaś</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>vasatér</i>	<i>apaptan</i> /
LP	2SG.GEN	bird:NOM.PL.M	PRT	dwelling:ABL.SG.F	fly:AOR.3PL
<i>náraś</i>		<i>ca</i>	<i>yé</i>	<i>pitubhājo</i>	
man:NOM.PL.M		and	REL:NOM.PL.M	enjoying.food:NOM.PL.M	
<i>víuṣṭau</i>					
flush:LOC.SG.F					

‘11. This young woman has whitened down from the east. She yokes the forefront of the ruddy cows. She will dawn forth now; her beacon will stand out. Agni will reverently come to house after house.

12. The birds have **also** flown up from their dwelling **and** the men who partake of food, at your first flush.’ RV 1.124.11–12b

The function of *cid* in this passage has been interpreted in different ways by the translators. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 289) translate it as a non-scalar additive particle, whereas Geldner (1951–1957: I, 173) and Witzel & Gotō (2007: 230) translate it as scalar ‘even’ (‘selbst’).⁷⁵ In contrast, Renou (1955–1969: III, 62) translates it as the intensifier ‘themselves’ (‘eux-mêmes’) and Ludwig (1876–1888: I, 15) as a comparative particle ‘like’ (‘wie’), both of which I reject.⁷⁶ As for the expression marked by *ca*, it seems to me that it is actually parenthetical rather than a part of the same sentence, since *víuṣṭau* ‘at the flush’ appears to be part of the main clause and not the relative clause (cf. Geldner 1907–1909: II, 23). This seems suspicious from a syntactic point of view, because normally relative clauses are not embedded.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ ‘Selbst die Vögel sind bei deinem Aufleuchten aus dem Neste aufgefliegen und die Männer, die ihre Nahrung zu sich nehmen, (von dem Lager)’ (Geldner); ‘Heraus sind selbst die Vögel aus dem Nest geflogen und die Männer, die an der Nahrung Anteil bekommen, bei deinem Hellwerden’ (Witzel & Gotō).

⁷⁶ ‘Les oiseaux eux-mêmes se sont envolés de leur nid à ton éclaircissement, ainsi que les hommes qui ont part à la nourriture’ (Renou); ‘wie vögel sind ausz der wonung dir geflogen männer, die speise haben, bei dem aufgang’ (Ludwig).

⁷⁷ See also Jamison’s (comm.VI.2: ad loc.) commentary on the identical stanza RV 6.64.6.

Böhlingk & Roth (1855–1875: II, 1026) give two examples which might be regarded as exhibiting the structure *cid* ... *u*. One is RV 1.191.10. There, *cid* occurs in one clause and *u* in the next. However, in the first of these clauses, *cid* is also preceded by *u*, so that the coordination is probably expressed by *u* ... *u*, rather than *cid* ... *u*.⁷⁸ The second example they give which involves *u* is ex. (94) below, where the pattern is *utá u cid* ... *cid*. I do not believe that this pattern is used to coordinate elements.

Thus far, I have only discussed cases of coordination within one clause that involve multiple instances of *cid*. There are, however, cases of constituent coordination in which *cid* appears only once, as in the following example:⁷⁹

(86)	<i>ichámíd</i>	<i>dhrdā́</i>	<i>mánasā́</i>	<i>cid</i>
	search:1SG+PRT	heart:INS.SG.N	mind:INS.SG.N	PRT
	<i>índram</i>			
	Indra:ACC.SG.M			

‘I am just searching, with my heart and mind, for Indra.’ RV 6.28.5d

In this passage, one may translate *hṛdā́ mánasā́ cid* as ‘with my heart and also with my mind’. Maquieira Rodríguez (2017: 436f.) sees a difference between connectors and focus particles. In contrast to connectors, which connect different elements, focus particles highlight one element. Yet, according to Forker (2016: 83), there are languages in which additives are the default way to mark coordination, as she shows by the following example from the Papuan language Makalero, where simple coordination may be expressed asyndetically or with an additive particle:

(87)	...	<i>kareta</i>	<i>motor=oo</i>	<i>we'e</i>	...
		car	motorbike=ADD	be.there	
		‘... there is (i.e. they have) a car and a motorbike...’			

As for Vedic, apart from asyndetic coordination the conjunctions *ca* and *utá* are usually used to coordinate elements (see Klein 1985b), so that *cid* is not to be regarded as a default way to mark coordination. Therefore, *cid* is to be interpreted as a focus particle here because as I interpret it the instrumentals *hṛdā́* ‘with the heart’ and *mánasā́* ‘with the mind’ are asyndetically coordinated and *cid* emphasizes that the second conjunct is added to the first one. Hence, the additive function of *cid* may be even more clearly visible here than in the cases in which two instances of *cid* emphatically coordinate two entities. A similar employment of *cid* is also attested in negative clauses. Consider ex. (88):

⁷⁸ Klein (1978b: 125) finds the presence of *só* problematic and interprets this example as containing the sequence *ná* ... *ná u*, so that he does not assume *cid* to be involved in the connection of the clauses either.

⁷⁹ Apparently, Geldner (1907–1909: II, 93) assigns *cid* a totalizing function in this passage. He compares it to *api* and translates it as ‘ganz’. On totalizing *cid* and *api* see Section 4.4.

(88)	<i>nahī</i>	<i>nú</i>	<i>vo</i>	<i>maruto</i>	<i>ánti</i>	<i>asmé</i>	/
	not.for	now	2PL.GEN	Marut:VOC.PL.M	nearby	1PL.LOC	
	<i>ārāttāc</i>	<i>cic</i>	<i>chávaso</i>	<i>ántam</i>	<i>āpúh</i>		
	from.distance	PRT	strength:GEN.SG.N	end:ACC.SG.M	reach:PERF.3PL		

‘For they have not reached the limit of your swelling strength, o Maruts, nearby to us nor **even** in the distance.’ RV 1.167.9ab

From a semantic point of view, this is a case of disjunction rather than conjunction, which is also reflected in the English translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 366). Without the presence of *cid* the clause expresses that they have not reached the limit nearby and they have not reached the limit in the distance; This is equivalent to saying that they have not reached the limit nearby or in the distance.⁸⁰ I am not certain whether *cid* is used with a scalar function, i.e. marking the second disjunct as more unlikely than the first one or simply to add the second disjunct as a further possible location where they might reach the limit of their strength. At any rate, the scalar function of *cid* is well compatible with such a disjunctive reading (cf. Bonifazi et al. 2016: IV.2, §119). A further case which is possibly to be treated like this is ex. (89):

(89)	<i>tám</i>	<i>ā</i>	<i>nūnám</i>	<i>vṛjānam</i>	<i>anyáthā</i>	<i>cic</i>	/
	DEM:ACC.SG.M	LP	now	community:ACC.SG.M	otherwise	PRT	
	<i>chūro</i>		<i>yác</i>	<i>chakra</i>	<i>ví</i>	<i>dúro</i>	
	hero:NOM.SG.M		because	mighty:VOC.SG.M	LP	door:ACC.PL.F	
	<i>grñīṣé</i>						
	praise:MID.2SG						

‘To this community (come) now and **also** at other times, since you, mighty one, are praised as a hero that opens the doors.’⁸¹ RV 6.35.5ab

Jamison & Brereton (2014: 819) and Jamison (comm.VI.2: ad loc.) explain that this is a complicated hemistich and that they are not certain about their own translation, which is ‘This community here and now do I sing, as (I did) also at another time, when as champion, able one, you (opened) wide the doors’. However, Jamison (comm.VI.2: ad loc.) remarks “that the antithetical temporal expressions we noted in the two previous hymns, *nūnám ... aparāya ca* ‘now and for the future’ (VI.33.5) and *purā nūnám ca* ‘previously and now’ (VI.34.1), may be echoed by *nūnám ... anyáthā cid* ‘now and also otherwise’”. This would be in accordance with Geldner (1951–1957: II, 133), according to whom one can translate pāda a as ‘To this community (come) now like at other times’.⁸² I will argue in Section 4.9 that *cid* does not have the meaning ‘like’ so that based on the commentary by Jamison I surmise that *nūnám* and *anyáthā* are coordinated, which yields the translation ‘to this community (come) now and also

⁸⁰ De Morgan’s law: $(\neg A \wedge \neg B) \Leftrightarrow \neg(A \vee B)$.

⁸¹ The translation deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

⁸² ‘Zu diesem Opferbund (?) (komm) jetzt wie sonst’.

at other times’. Notice that in their translation, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 819), like Geldner, assign a temporal rather than a modal meaning to *anyáthā*, which I do as well.⁸³

The previous part of this section has been primarily concerned with the employment of multiple and also single *cid* within one clause. The remaining part will be dedicated to the question of whether *cid* can also be employed to connect not only expressions within one clause but also different clauses with each other. From a typological perspective, the assumption that *cid* may have a connective function is plausible, for additives are often employed as conjunctive adverbs (König 1991: 65; Forker 2016: 81f.). In the following, I will refer to such adverbs as DISCOURSE MARKERS. König (1991: 65) presumes that when an additive operator functions as a discourse marker both its scope and its focus comprise the entire sentence. As an example, he gives the following German sentences:

(90) *Ich habe keine Zeit. **Ebenso/auch** fehlt es mir an Geld.*

‘I haven’t got the time. **Also** I lack the funds.’

In this example, *ebenso* or *auch* scope over the entire second sentence. Moreover, this sentence is an alternative to the first one. One case in which Vedic *cid* can be analyzed as a discourse marker is the following passage:

(91)	<i>yamáśya</i>	<i>mā</i>	<i>yamíyaṃ</i>	<i>kāma</i>	
	Yama:GEN.SG.M	1SG.ACC	Yamī:ACC.SG.F	desire:NOM.SG.M	
	<i>āgan</i>	/	<i>samāné</i>	<i>yónau</i>	<i>sahaśéiyāya</i> /
	LP.go:AOR.3SG		same:LOC.SG.M	womb:LOC.SG.M	lying.together:DAT.SG.N
	<i>jāyēva</i>	<i>pátye</i>	<i>tanúvaṃ</i>	<i>riricyāṃ</i>	/
	wife:NOM.SG.F+like	husband:DAT.SG.M	body:ACC.SG.F	yield:PERF.OPT.1SG	
	<i>ví</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>vṛheva</i>	<i>ráthiyeva</i>	<i>cakrā</i>
	LP	PRT	tear:OPT.IDU	of.chariot:NOM.DU.M+like	wheel:NOM.DU.M

‘Desire for Yama has come to me, Yamī, to lie together in the same womb [/place]. Like a wife to her husband I would yield my body. We would “let ’er rip” like two chariot wheels.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1382)

‘... **Also**, we would “let ’er rip” like two chariot wheels.’ (my adaptation) RV 10.10.7

In this passage, Yamī tries to convince her twin brother Yama to have sex with her. In the second hemistich, where each pāda consists of one clause, she describes what this would be like. In pāda d, the precise meaning of the predicate *vi vṛh-* and the nature of the simile *ráthiyā iva cakra* ‘like the wheels of a chariot’ are not entirely clear (see e.g. Schneider 1967–1968: 8f., Bodewitz 2009: 270f., Pinault 2012: 156–158, Kulikov 2018: 51, Jamison comm.X.1: ad loc.). Nonetheless, it seems that in pādas c and d two different events are described, first that

⁸³ Dōyama & Gotō (2022: 72) prefer a modal interpretation: ‘Herbei zu dieser Gemeinschaft (komm) nun, auf welche Weise auch immer’. However, I reject the indefinite function which they appear to assign to *cid* (see Section 4.4).

Yamī would yield her body to Yama and secondly that the two of them would roll around (vel sim.). As a result, the entire clause in pāda d constitutes an alternative to the one in pāda c and accordingly can be regarded the focus of *cid*. I therefore conclude that *cid* functions as a discourse marker in this passage.⁸⁴

Another group of passages that appears to be related to the use of *cid* as a discourse marker illustrated in ex. (91) above, are those in which *cid* occurs after the discourse marker *ádha* ‘then, therefore’ and the conjunction *utó* (*utá u*) ‘and’. That *cid* occurs after such elements seems surprising at first sight. For Hale (1991: 9) states that connectives like these “are almost certainly not being ‘emphasized’ in any meaningful sense in spite of their placement in initial position” and Deshpande (1991: 19) agrees with him. However, Forker (2016: 81f.) states that in a quarter of the languages she examined, additives function as conjunctive adverbs. She finds that in these cases they are usually associated with the first element of the clause, which may sometimes be a temporal adverb. Moreover, she observes that “[f]requently the second clause is not simply a continuation or refers to the next situation in a temporal sequence, but more specifically describes a consequence of the situation expressed in the first clause”. The latter case is likely to be found in the Rigveda, namely when *cid* occurs after the adverb *ádha*. I will exemplify the use of *cid* after this adverb by means of the following two passages:

(92) *yūyám hí śṭhā sudānava /*
 2PL.NOM for be:2PL with.good.gifts:VOC.PL.M
índrajyeṣṭhā abhídyavaḥ / ádhā cid va
 with.Indra.at.top:NOM.PL.M heavenly:NOM.PL.M then PRT 2PL.DAT
utá bruve
 and speak:MID.1SG

‘For ye, O givers of good gifts, are heavenly ones having Indra as your superior. And therefore do I speak unto you.’⁸⁵ RV 8.83.9

(93) *yuvóḥ krāṇāya sakhiyáir / abhí śiyāma*
 2DU.GEN do:PTCP.AOR.MID.DAT.SG.M friendship:INS.PL.N LP be:OPT.1PL
rakṣásah // ádhā cin nú yád dídhīṣāmahe vām /
 demon:ACC.PL.M then PRT now when put:DES.MID.1PL 2DU.ACC
[...] sám ū āran nákir asya
 LP PRT move:AOR.3PL nobody DEM:GEN.SG.M
maghāni
 bounty:ACC.PL.N

‘By your comradeship for the man who performs (ritual) for himself might we prevail over demons. And **even** now, when we seek to establish you two here, [...] no one shall bring his bounties (for us) into collision’ RV 10.132.2cd, 3

⁸⁴ Schnaus (2008: 177–179) merely glosses *cid* as an emphatic particle in this passage.

⁸⁵ The translation is adopted from Klein (1985a: 98).

Following Klein (1985a: 95f.), *ádha* “possesses a logical conjunctive value” in ex. (92). In his discussion of the passage, Klein (1985b: 38, 1985a: 97f.) highlights the fact that, albeit both connectives, the adverb *ádha* ‘therefore’ and the conjunction *utá* ‘and’ function separately. He (1985b: 384) furthermore states that in this stanza *ádha* “signals a relatively loose union between [pādas] ab and c”. He does not, however, give remarks on the unusual position of *utá* (Jamison comm.VIII.2: ad loc.) or the presence of *cid* next to *ádha*. On the basis of their translation, I assume that Jamison & Brereton’s (2014: 1182) interpretation of *cid* differs from mine. They translate pāda c as ‘And so I call just upon you’. Thus, it appears that they regard *cid* in this sentence as an exclusive particle (‘just’) associated with the pronoun *vas* ‘you’ (cf. Section 4.8). As I have mentioned, I will not assume that *cid* is associated with a following word unless it is absolutely necessary. I therefore assume that *ádha cid* has a connective function here. Perhaps, *cid* is used here to mark exhaustive focus, so that one might translate the last pāda as ‘And it is therefore that I speak unto you’ (see Section 4.8).

Ex. (93) shows that *cid* also occurs with *ádha* when it does not have the causal meaning ‘therefore’. Klein (1985a: 119; 125) assigns it the meaning ‘now’ in this passage, which is enhanced by the particle *nú* ‘now’. Here, too, *cid* appears to have an emphatic function (see Klein 1980: 213f.). As the translation of the example suggests, one may interpret it as a scalar additive particle. As the discussion of exx. (92) and (93) shows, *cid* seems to function as a focus particle when it precedes *ádha*, although its precise function may be difficult to determine. Other text passages of this type are RV 1.180.7, 7.4.8 and 8.92.29.

Even less clear are the following two examples, where *cid* occurs not with an adverb but with the conjunction *utó*. Note that whereas Lubotsky (1997: 332; 336) and RIVELEX (II, 276f.) interpret *utó* as a sequence of *utá* ‘and’ and the conjunctive particle *u*, Klein (1985b: 441) synchronically regards *utó* as “a metrical variant of *utá* equivalent in its origins to *utá+u*”:

(94)	<i>prkṣáprayajo</i>		<i>draviṇaḥ</i>		<i>suvácaḥ</i>	/
	with.first.offerings:NOM.PL.F		wealth:VOC.SG.N		with.good.words:NOM.PL.F	
	<i>suketáva</i>		<i>uśáso</i>		<i>revád</i>	<i>ūsuḥ</i> /
	with.lovely.light:NOM.PL.F		dawn:NOM.PL.F		rich:ACC.SG.N	dawn:PERF.3PL
	<i>utó</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>agne</i>		<i>mahinā</i>	<i>prthivyāḥ</i> /
	and	PRT	Agni:VOC.SG.M		greatness:INS.SG.M	earth:GEN.SG.F
	<i>kṛtám</i>		<i>cid</i>	<i>énaḥ</i>	<i>sám</i>	<i>mahé</i>
	do:PPP.ACC.SG.N		PRT	sin:ACC.SG.N	LP	great:DAT.SG.N
	<i>daśasya</i>					
	be.merciful:IMP.2SG					

‘O Wealth—the dawns, owning the fortifying first offerings, receiving the beautiful words, bearing lovely beacons, have dawned richly. And now, o Agni, by the greatness

of earth, for the sake of our great (fortune), be favorable even to the (ritual) fault we have committed.’ RV 3.7.10

(95)	<i>utó</i>	<i>rayīḥ</i>		<i>pr̥ṇató</i>		<i>nópa</i>	
	and	wealth.NOM.SG.M		fill:PTCP.PRS.ACT.GEN.SG.M		NEG+LP	
	<i>dasyati</i>		/	<i>utápr̥ṇan</i> [= <i>utá ápr̥ṇan</i>]		<i>marḍitāraṃ</i>	<i>ná</i>
	become.exhausted:3SG			and+not.giving:NOM.SG.M		pitier:ACC.SG.M	NEG
	<i>vindate</i>	//	<i>yá</i>		<i>ādhṛāya</i>		[...] / [...] /
	find:MID.3SG		REL:NOM.SG.M		poor:DAT.SG.M		
	<i>sthirám</i>	<i>mánaḥ</i>		<i>kṛṇuté</i>	<i>sévate</i>	<i>purá</i>	/
	solid:ACC.SG.N	mind:ACC.SG.N		do:MID.3SG	enjoy:MID.3SG	earlier	
	<i>utó</i>	<i>cit</i>	<i>sá</i>		<i>marḍitāraṃ</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>vindate</i>
	and	PRT	DEM:NOM.SG.M		pitier:ACC.SG.M	NEG	find:MID.3SG

‘Moreover, the wealth of one who gives does not become exhausted, and the non-giver finds no one to show mercy. Whoever [...] hardens his heart [against a poor man], though he always used to be his friend, he **also** finds no one to show mercy.’ RV 10.117.1c–2

Grassmann (1873: 455) assigns *cid* after *utó* a generalizing function, similar to the passages in which it follows the conjunction *yád* or the relative pronoun *yá-*. However, this is not one of the contexts in which I believe *cid* to have this function. Klein (1985b: 457f.) states that in the passage in ex. (94) “the precise role of *utá* is uncertain or ambiguous”. He assumes that it may have causal meaning, referring either to the entire previous context or to the presence of the dawn. Geldner (1951–1957: I, 345) does not assume a clause boundary before *utó*, but he regards pāda c rather as an afterthought. He translates *utá* as the conjunction ‘and’ and *cid* as an additive particle whose focus is a non-overt second singular pronoun (or the vocative *agne?*).⁸⁶ Witzel et al. (2013: 27) do assume a clause boundary before *utá*, but they regard pādas c and d as different clauses. Like Geldner they assume a second person referent as the focus of *cid*.⁸⁷ Renou (1955–1969: XII, 57) construes *cid* with *mahinā pṛthivyāḥ* ‘by the greatness of the earth’.⁸⁸

The functions of *utó* and *cid* in ex. (95) appear to differ from the ones in ex. (94). Again, I disagree with Grassmann (1873: 455), and also Mumm (2004: 57f.), who assign *cid* a generalizing function. Klein (1985b: 448f.) regards *utó* in pāda 2d as an additive particle ‘as well’ (see also e.g. Macdonell [n.d.]: 92, Renou 1956: 113). This suggests that both *utó* and *cid* are to be interpreted as additive particles. Following Klein, the function of *utó* in this passage

⁸⁶ ‘Die lobesamen, schön scheinenden Morgenröten, deren Opfer wirksam sind (?), sind reichlich spendend aufgegangen, o Schatz(spender) und auch du, Agni, soweit die Erde reicht. — Vergib auch die getane Sünde zu großem (Glücke?)!’.

⁸⁷ ‘Und auch du, Agni, (leuchtest) mit der Größe der Erde. Auch die (schon) getane Übeltat vergib, zu großem (Heil)!’.

⁸⁸ ‘Ainsi donc, ô Agni, (au nom) de la grandeur même de la Terre, pardonne le péché fût-il (déjà) commis, pour (notre) grande (chance)!’

is to express that the referent of pāda 1d and 2d will suffer the same fate (*ápr̥nan* ‘(the one) not giving’ in 1d is the explicit alternative value to *sá* ‘he’ in 2d). Maybe the combination *utó cid* is used here as a stylistic device to enhance the statement that the two referents will be treated alike.⁸⁹ Support for this can be found by including the previous stanza in the analysis. The two instances of *utá* in pādas 1c and d conjoin two clauses in which a contrast between two different people is expressed (Klein 1985b: 455). In contrast, *utá* in pāda 2d expresses that the subjects of pādas 1d and an 2d are treated alike, i.e. they are alternatives of each other. Thus, *cid* possibly has been added to signal that *utá* is used in a different fashion in pāda 2d than in pādas 1c/d.

Regarding ex. (83), I have argued that *cid* following each of the conjoined expressions within a clause can express emphatic coordination. This raises the question of whether *cid* in two conjoined clauses can have the same function, i.e. to emphatically conjoin the clauses. Such a function is most likely to be encountered when *cid* occurs in parallel positions in subsequent clauses or pādas. One such case is the following:

(96)	<i>yá</i>	<i>ugrébhyaś</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>ójyāñ</i>	/
	REL:NOM.SG.M	strong:ABL.PL.M	PRT	strong:COMP.NOM.SG.M	
	<i>chúrebhyaś</i>	<i>cic</i>	<i>chúratarah</i>	/	
	champion:ABL.PL.M	PRT	champion:COMP.NOM.SG.M		
	<i>bhūridābhyaś</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>māṇhīyān</i>		
	giving.much.ABL.PL.M	PRT	generous:COMP.NOM.SG.M		

‘(You,) who are stronger **even** than the strong, more a champion **even** than champions, more generous **even** than those who give much’ RV 9.66.17

This stanza contains three coordinated relative clauses, only in the first of which is an overt relative pronoun present. Each clause describes one property of Soma and *cid* may emphasize that each of these properties holds true for Soma. If one applies the analysis of emphatically coordinating elements by Hendriks (2004) this would mean that as in ex. (83), each conjunct, i.e. each of the (unmarked) relative clauses in pāda b and c, constitutes the respective focus *cid*. Accordingly one might translate ‘(you), who are both ... and ... and ...’. This may be possible but as the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1294) suggests, *cid* may also have the function of a scalar additive particle within each clause. It adds the complements of the comparatives that constitute the predicates to other alternatives and marks them as unlikely. Thus, even though the presence of *cid* underlines the parallel structure of the pādas, I do not regard it primarily as a marker of coordination. I have not identified the coordination of clauses as the primary function of *cid* in other passages either.

⁸⁹ Cf. the use of apodotic use of *καί* ‘and, also’ in Greek, which occurs with “discourse acts that are of equal weight, possibly expanding on preceding material or highlighting the ongoing piece of narration” (Bonifazi et al. 2016: IV.2, §137).

A particularly difficult stanza including two instances of *cid*, and also of *caná*, in two subsequent clauses is the following one, which occurs in a dialogue hymn:

(97)	<i>mámac</i>	<i>caná</i>	<i>tvā</i>	<i>yuvatīh</i>	<i>parāsa</i>	/
	1SG.ABL	PRT	2SG.ACC	young:NOM.SG.F	LP.be:PERF.3SG	
	<i>mámac</i>	<i>caná</i>	<i>tvā</i>	<i>kuṣāvā</i>	<i>jagāra</i>	/
	1SG.ABL	PRT	2SG.ACC	Kuṣāvā:NOM.SG.F	swallow:PERF.3SG	
	<i>mámac</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>āpaḥ</i>	<i>śísave</i>		
	1SG.ABL	PRT	water:NOM.PL.F	child:DAT.SG.M		
	<i>mamṛdyur</i>		/	<i>mámac</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>índraḥ</i>
	have.mercy:PERF.OPT.3PL			1SG.ABL	PRT	Indra:NOM.SG.M
	<i>sáhasód</i>	<i>atiṣthat</i>				
	might.INS.SG.N.+LP	stand:IPRF.3SG				

‘[Various voices of the waters:] It was not because of me that the young woman cast you aside. It was not because of me that Kuṣāvā (Evil Birth) swallowed you. But it was **certainly** because of me that the waters would show mercy to the child. It was **certainly** because of me that Indra stood up with his might.’ RV 4.18.8

As previous commentaries and analyses of this stanza show, its interpretation has caused severe problems. To begin with, it is unclear who the speaker of this stanza is. There are several suggestions, namely that this stanza is not part of the dialogue anymore (Pischel 1897: 47), that Indra’s mother (Aditi) utters the whole stanza (Ludwig 1876–1888: V, 466; Oldenberg 1909–1912: I, 282; Geldner 1951–1957: I, 442f.; Doniger O’Flaherty 1981: 142; Viti 2007: 194f.), that pādas a/b are spoken by Aditi and b/c by Vāmadeva (Sieg 1902: 84) or that the pādas are spoken by different voices of the waters (Hillebrandt 1913: 45; Jamison & Brereton 2014: 586). Moreover, the accentuation of the finite verbs in pādas a and b is problematic, for usually they are only accented in subordinate clauses. See Oldenberg (1906: 725f.), Klein (1992: 72f.), Schnaus (2008: 122) and Jamison (comm.IV: ad loc.) for a possible explanation. From a morphological point of view, the form *mámat* which only occurs in this hymn, has been interpreted in multiple ways. Sāyaṇa explains it as ‘exulting’ (Griffith 1896–1897: I, 417). Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 281f.) assesses several possibilities. He rejects the translation by Sieg (1902: 84f.), who interprets it as a verb form, as well as the interpretation by Böhlingk & Roth (1855–1875: V, 559), who render it ‘sometimes ... sometimes’ (‘modo — modo’). He appears to consider Pischel’s (1897: 47f.) translation ‘kaum ... als’, ‘kaum ... da’, i.e. ‘no sooner ... than’, possible. This is rejected by Ludwig (1893: 145). Oldenberg tentatively suggests translating it as the concessive construction ‘zwar – aber’ but he also, referring to Ludwig (1893: 145), considers interpreting it as an irregularly reduplicated form of *mát*, the ablative of the 1SG personal pronoun (cf. also Benfey 1852–1854: I, 332). The latter interpretation is shared by Geldner (1951–1957: I, 442f.), Hettrich (1988: 258), Schnaus (2008: 120f.), Witzel et al.

(2013: 488f.) and Jamison (comm.IV: ad loc.) and I follow this view. The particle *caná* is difficult to interpret from a semantic point of view, for it can be positive ‘also/even’ or negative ‘also/even not’ (see exx. (60)–(62) in Section 4.1).⁹⁰ Channing (1889: cii) and Witzel et al. (2013: 148) regard it as positive.⁹¹ Schnaus (2008: 121f.) considers both alternatives possible but eventually opts for a positive interpretation. I follow Geldner (1951–1957: I, 442f.), Hauri (1963: 90f.), Doniger O’Flaherty (1981: 142), Kümmel (2000: 114), Viti (2007: 194f.), Jamison & Brereton (2014: 586) and Jamison (comm.IV: ad loc.), who interpret *caná* as negative.⁹² Ludwig (1876–1888: II, 591) regards it as positive but later revises his assumption because of the presence of *cid* in the second hemistich (Ludwig 1893: 145).

This finally leads to the question regarding the function of *cid*. Given that it is correct that *caná* is negative and that *mamát* is a pronoun, one can in general say that this stanza enumerates four things that did or did not happen to Indra because of the speaker(s). The first two pādas mention two things that did not happen whereas the latter two mention two things that did happen. Hence, with Jamison (comm.IV: ad loc.) and Klein (1992: 72f.; 2013: 147f.) I assume that there is a contrast between the first and the second hemistich and that this contrast is underlined by the use of *caná* vs. *cid*. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 586) attempt to express this contrast by translating *cid* as ‘certainly’ in the second hemistich, but I am not certain whether this correctly reflects the function that *cid* has here.⁹³ Instead, one might assume that *caná* and *cid* actually function as some kind of emphatic conjunction here. Then one might translate: ‘Neither did A happen because of me, nor did B happen because of me. (However,) both C happened because of me and D happened because of me’. Yet, this would require that at least the two pādas within one hemistich are spoken by the same person. A second possibility would be to assume that *cid* is associated with *mamát* and marks exhaustive focus (cf. Section 4.8). This is partly reflected in the translation by Jamison & Brereton, who use a cleft in each pāda. This would mean that *cid* expresses that ‘it was because of me (instead of someone else) that X happened’. The advantage would be that this interpretation is also plausible if all four pādas are spoken by different speakers. The overt alternatives would then be the other referents of *mamát*. The problem is, however, that one would have to assume that *caná* is able to mark exhaustive focus as well, which it does not seem to do elsewhere (Grassmann 1873: 434f.; Klein 1985b:

⁹⁰ Hettrich (1988: 258f.) reads *ca ná*, which is rejected by Klein (1992: 72f.).

⁹¹ ‘Meinetwegen etwa hat dich die junge Frau beiseite gelegt? Meinetwegen etwa hat dich die Kuṣavā verschlungen? Meinetwegen, wenn überhaupt, dürften sich die Wasser des Kindes erbarmt haben. Meinetwegen, wenn überhaupt, erhob sich Indra kräftig’ (Witzel et al.).

⁹² ‘Nicht um meinetwillen **hat** dich das Mädchen **verworfen**, noch hat dich um meinetwillen Kuṣavā verschlungen’ (Kümmel; his boldface type).

⁹³ I do not agree with Witzel et al.’s (2013: 148) translation ‘wenn überhaupt’.

285–292). As a result, due to the severe difficulties with respect to the interpretation of this stanza, the function of *cid* in ex. (97) has to remain unclear. Nevertheless, the structure of the stanza suggests that *caná* and *cid* are employed here to enhance the parallel structure of the *pādas*.

This concludes my discussion of multiple (and single) *cid* and its connective function. I have discussed cases where two instances of *cid* in one clause function independently of each other and are associated with coreferential expressions. When the expressions with which *cid* is associated are alternatives of each other, I have distinguished three groups: 1) *cid* has scalar additive function 2) *cid* expresses free-choice disjunction 3) *cid* expresses emphatic coordination. These groups are related to each other and in all of them the additive function of *cid* is observable. While I have shown that *cid* may occur with only one member of a conjunction, I have argued that it does not express emphatic coordination in the combinations *cid ... ca* or *cid ... u*. In addition to multiple *cid* within one clause, I have discussed a case of multiple *cid* within subsequent clauses. Even though in a case like ex. (96) multiple *cid* might be interpreted as coordinating clauses, I argued that it is not its primary function. I have also examined those cases in which *cid* occurs after the discourse marker *ádha* and the conjunction *utó*. I have not been able to determine the exact function of *cid* after these forms but I assume that it somehow contributes to their connective function. In the one case where *utó* is used as an additive particle I assume that *cid* is used to clarify or emphasize this function.

4.3 *cid* in lexicalized collocations

This section is concerned with two types of lexicalized collocations in which *cid* regularly occurs. In the first type, *cid* follows an interrogative proform and thereby renders it indefinite. In the second type, *cid* follows the adverb *nú* ‘now’. This combination mostly yields the negative meaning ‘never’ but there are also passages in which the transparent meaning ‘even now’ is still present. In Section 4.3.1, I will examine those cases in which *cid* is part of an indefinite proform and demonstrate the different functions that these indefinite forms have. In Section 4.3.2, I will discuss the collocation *nú cid* and attempt to account for the distribution of the positive and the negative form in the Rigveda.

4.3.1 Interrogative proform + *cid*

From a typological point of view, it is not unusual that additives combine with interrogatives to form indefinite pronouns (Forker 2016: 79). The Rigveda exhibits two types of indefinite pronouns. On the one hand, there are the simple indefinite pronouns *sama-* ‘any, every’ and *simá-* ‘every, all’; on the other hand there are indefinite pronouns that consist of the interrogative pronoun *ká-* and the particles *ca*, *caná* or *cid* (Macdonell 1910: 304).⁹⁴ The present investigation is only concerned with the combination of interrogatives with the particle *cid* (on the combination with *caná* see Jäger 2010: 815f.). Most recently, Briceño Villalobos (2019: 128–164) conducted an investigation of Indo-Iranian indefinites. His study examines books 2–9 of the Rigveda (Briceño Villalobos 2019: 117). I will examine the entire Rigveda.

The particle *cid* occurs 51 times after the interrogative pronoun *ka-*. The employment of *ká- cid* in the Rigveda can be seen in the following text passage:

(98)	<i>indrād</i>	<i>á</i>	<i>kás</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>bhayate</i>
	Indra:ABL.SG.M	LP	who:NOM.SG.M	PRT	fear:MID.3SG
	<i>távīyasaḥ</i>				
	strong:COMP.ABL.SG.M				

‘**Anyone** feels fear before Indra the stronger’ RV 10.92.8b

Forker (2016: 79) explains that from a morphological point of view, this type of formation cannot be regarded as derivation, for case, number and gender are not affixed to the additive morpheme but are marked on the interrogative stem, which precedes the additive morpheme. It is noteworthy that additives are not the only means to form an indefinite pronoun on the basis of interrogative pronouns. One other strategy that Haspelmath (1997: 179–182) mentions is the reduplication of an interrogative pronoun. Due to the etymological origin of *cid* (< $*=k^u id$), which is the unstressed form of the neuter interrogative, one might ask which of the two types is actually present in a case like ex. (98). Thus, Viti (2007: 44) claims that the participation of *cid* in the formation of indefinite pronouns indicates its origin as an interrogative and refers to forms like Hittite *kuiški*, Latin *quisquis* and Gothic *hvazuh*. However, in contrast to a reduplicated form like Latin *quisquis*, the second element of Vedic *ká- cid* always remains in the same form. Compare the nominative singular masculine *quisquis* : *kás cid* with the neuter form *quidquid* : *kád cid* (besides *kím cid*) in Latin and Vedic. Therefore, and because *cid* is synchronically not attested as an interrogative pronoun, I consider *ká- cid* as an indefinite formed by an interrogative pronoun and an additive particle (cf. also Briceño Villalobos 2019: 132f.). Moreover, Hittite *kuiški* does not reflect $*k^u is-k^u is$ but $*k^u is-k^u id$ and therefore is not a

⁹⁴ This is the only function in which *cid* is preserved in Classical Sanskrit.

reduplicated form. Likewise, Gothic *hvazuh* contains the interrogative pronoun and the particle *-uh* (see Klein & Condon 1993 on the function of the latter). Since additives are so regularly involved in the formation of indefinites, it is not necessary to assume a different function of *cid* either. For instance, Schnaus (2008: 66) glosses *cid* as generalizing particle (“verallgemeindernde Partikel”) in the function discussed here but as an emphatic particle (“betonende Partikel”) elsewhere (e.g. 2008: 26). In Section 4.4, I will argue especially against such an analysis.

Now that I have clarified the formal nature of forms like *ká- cid*, I will turn to their employment in the Rigveda. Regarding the semantics of the indefinites that are formed by additives, Forker (2016: 79) identifies the following types:

Types of indefinite meanings that are formed by making use of additives are: (i) specific indefinites similar to the English some-series, (ii) universal indefinites resembling the English every-series, (iii) negative indefinites comparable to the English no-series, and (iv) free-choice indefinites of the English ever-type. Occasionally, the indefinite pronouns containing additives cover only one type of meaning.

Note, first of all, that “[t]he precise characterization of the meaning of free-choice indefinites has proved to be a difficult task” (Haspelmath 1997: 49). I will therefore to a large degree rely on translatability into English free-choice indefinites like *any* or *X-ever*, even though this is problematic. Moreover, I will regard the contexts given by Haspelmath (1997: 48–51) in which free-choice indefinites may or may not occur. For possible characterizations of free-choice indefinites see Haspelmath (1997: 90–94; 111–118). Returning now to the groups given by Forker, I find all four of them attested by *ká- cid* in the Rigveda. Groups (i), (ii) and (iv) are exemplified in the following passages. I will discuss group (iii) further below. Ex. (99) shows the use of group (i); ex. (102) shows the use of group (ii); ex. (101) shows the use of group (iv). Ex. (100) is ambiguous between groups (ii) and (iv):

(99) *ví yád vācam · kīstāso bhārante /*
 LP when speech:ACC.SG.F praiser:NOM.PL.M carry:MID.3PL
śāmsanti ké cin nivído
 recite:3PL who:NOM.PL.M PRT invocation:ACC.PL.F
manānāḥ /
 think:PTCP.AOR.MID.NOM.PL.M
ād vām bravāma satyāni ukthā

‘When the praisers distribute their speech and **some** recite the formal invocations, paying them heed, after that we will speak to you pronouncements that come true’ RV 6.67.10a–c

(100) *tuvé ráya indara tośátamāḥ /*
 2SG.LOC wealth:NOM.PL.M Indra:VOC.SG.M flowing:SUP.NOM.PL.M
praṇetārah · kāsya cid ṛtāyóḥ
 leader:NOM.PL.M who:GEN.SG.M PRT pious:GEN.SG.M

‘In you, Indra, are most overflowing riches, the leaders of **whoever** seeks the truth.’
(Jamison & Brereton 2014: 369)

‘... that further **every one** who lives uprightly’ (Griffith 1896–1897: I, 235) RV 1.169.5ab

(101) <i>tuvám</i>	<i>tásya</i>	<i>dvayāvino</i>	/	
2SG.NOM	DEM:GEN.SG.M	dishonest:GEN.SG.M		
<i>aghásamsasya</i>	<i>kásya</i>	<i>cit</i>	/	<i>padābhí</i>
utterer.of.evil:GEN.SG.M	who:GEN.SG.M	PRT		foot:INS.SG.M+LP
<i>tiṣṭha</i>	<i>tápuṣim</i>			
stand:IMP.2SG	scorching:ACC.SG.F			

‘The double-dealing utterer of evil, **whoever he is**—with your foot stamp on his scorching (weapon).’ RV 1.42.4

(102) <i>sá</i>	<i>śrudhi</i>	<i>yáḥ</i>	<i>smā</i>	<i>pr̥tanāsu</i>
DEM:NOM.SG.M	hear:AOR.IMP.2SG	REL:NOM.SG.M	PRT	battle:LOC.PL.F
<i>kāsu</i>	<i>cid</i>	/	<i>dakṣāyya</i>	<i>indra</i>
who:LOC.PL.F	PRT		skill:GDV.NOM.SG.M	Indra:VOC.SG.M
<i>bhārahūtaye</i>	<i>nṛbhir</i>	/	<i>ási</i>	
battle.cry:DAT.SG.F	man:INS.PL.M		be:2SG	

‘Listen—you who in **every** battle are to be besought by men for your skill for the battle cry, Indra’ RV 1.129.2a–c

Consider first ex. (99). Although the interpretations of what exactly is described in this stanza differ (cf. Jamison comm.VI.2: ad loc.) it is clear that the subclause in pāda a describes the actions of the praisers during the sacrifice. The main clause in pāda b then describes the actions of a specific subset of these praisers. Hence, Griffith (1896–1897: I, 640) and Jamison & Brereton (2014: 868) translate *ké cid* as ‘some’ and Renou (1955–1969: V, 84) as ‘certains’. Geldner (1951–1957: II, 171) translates it somewhat differently, but still in accordance with the specific interpretation, as ‘die einen’, i.e. as ‘the one (subgroup)’.⁹⁵ Since the literature shows that the definition of specificity is problematic, I will restrict myself to the informal definition that a nominal expression is specific if the speaker “intends to refer to a particular referent, the referent ‘the speaker has in mind’” (von Heusinger 2019: 146) for the sake of this study.⁹⁶ With respect to ex. (99), Briceño Villalobos (2019: 131) does not appear to agree with my analysis. He states that he only finds RV. 9.110.5b,6b and 8.21.1b as specific uses of *ka- cid*.⁹⁷ At any rate, we agree that *ká- cid* can function as a specific indefinite.

⁹⁵ ‘When singers in their song uplift their voices, some chant the Nivid texts with steady purpose’ (Griffith); ‘si de mauvais-prêtres distribuent la parole, (que) certains récitent croyant (avoir affaire à de simples) litanies-invitées’ (Renou); ‘Wenn die Sänger die Rede verteilen, so tragen die einen vor, was sie für Einladungssprüche halten’ (Geldner) Compare with these translations the one by Dōyama & Gotō (2022: 133): ‘Wenn die Kīstas die Rede verbreiten, verkünden irgendwelche (sie), die Widmungen ausdenkend’.

⁹⁶ For an overview of specificity see von Heusinger (2011, 2019).

⁹⁷ His example (11a) appears to be marked as RV 9.101 by mistake; I assume that the passage given there is RV 9.110.6b.

The indefinite pronoun *ká- cid* also has a universally quantifying function. However, this is not always easily distinguishable from the free-choice function, which the different interpretations of ex. (100) show: As can be seen in the example, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 369) interpret *kásya cid* as a free-choice indefinite. In contrast, Griffith (1896–1897: I, 235) opts for the interpretation as a universal indefinite. The latter interpretation is also preferred by Grassmann (1876–1877: II, 166), Geldner (1951–1957: I, 247) and Witzel & Gotō (2007: 315).⁹⁸ The fact that the free-choice and the universal meanings are difficult to distinguish is not surprising, because “[i]n many environments, free-choice indefinites can be replaced by universal quantifiers without a noticeable change in the truth conditions” (Haspelmath 1997: 48).

Nevertheless, there are clearer cases than this passage. I consider ex. (101), to be a clear case of a free-choice indefinite, a function which is also identified by Briceño Villalobos (2019: 134). Considering again the typological data by Haspelmath, such an analysis of ex. (101) seems to be unexpected at first sight. For the predicate is in the imperative mood and according to Haspelmath (1997: 49f.), free-choice indefinites are dispreferred in non-specific environments with imperatives, unless they express permission rather than a command or request. Ex. (101) constitutes such a dispreferred environment because it expresses a request and does not refer to the weapon of one specific utterer of evil. The reason for this apparent contradiction lies in the syntactic interpretation of *kásya cid*. Since the nominal expression *dvayāvīnas aghásamsasyas* ‘of the double-dealing utterer of evil’ is already determined by the singular demonstrative *tásya, kásya cid*, with either of its functions, cannot be a part of this nominal expression. As a result, in accordance with the translators, I interpret it as a parenthetical comment that is outside the clause. This syntactic analysis does not allow for an interpretation of *kásya cid* as a universal quantifier (*‘The double-dealing utterer of evil, (namely) everyone’).

Ex. (102) is different. There, the predicate of the relative clause consists of the copula and a “(pseudo-)gerundive” (Jamison comm.I.2: ad loc.), which expresses the necessity of an action. According to the typological study by Haspelmath (1997: 49), “free-choice indefinites are unacceptable in contexts of necessity” and I consider the interpretation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 297), according to which the modal operator is within the scope of the quantifier, the most plausible one. This allows for the conclusion that the interrogative pronoun followed by

⁹⁸ ‘Bei dir, o Indra, sind die reichsten Gaben, die, welche jeden frommgesinnten fördern’ (Grassmann); ‘Bei dir, Indra, sind die freigebigsten Reichtümer, die jeden Rechtwandelnden vorwärts bringen’ (Geldner); ‘Bei dir sind, Indra, die sich am meisten drängenden Reichtümer, die Vorwärtsführer jedes Rechtwandelnden (*rtāyú*) sind’ (Witzel & Gotō).

cid expresses universal quantification. Briceño Villalobos (2019: 134) does not appear to assign the function of a universal quantifier to *ká- cid*. He states that *ká- cid* and its Old Iranian cognates have free-choice semantics, which he considers to be inherited, but that “in most Old Iranian [i.e. not Vedic] occurrences, this inherited value has been modified into a distributive-universal meaning ‘each, everyone’”.⁹⁹ However, he finds the universal semantics in the conspicuous form *káya- cid*, which I will discuss in exx. (113)–(115) below. As for the distribution of the different functions of *ká- cid* in the Rigveda, I adhere to my practice of not giving numbers due to ambiguities as in ex. (100).

The following two text passages are examples of Forker’s third group, negative indefinites. In ex. (103), the indefinite *ké cid* appears within the scope of the negator *ná* and in ex. (104) of the prohibitive particle *má* and thereby assumes the meaning ‘no one’ (Delbrück 1893–1900: I, 512f.; Briceño Villalobos 2019: 150):

(103) *gúhiyā* *ná* *ké* *cid*
 hidden:NOM.PL.M NEG who:NOM.PL.M PRT
 ‘**none** are hidden.’ RV 7.103.8d

(104) *má* *tvā* *ké* *cin* *ní* *yaman*
 NEG 2SG.ACC who:NOM.PL.M PRT LP hold:AOR.INJ.3PL
vīm *nā* *pāśino*
 bird:ACC.SG.M like with.snares:NOM.SG.M

‘Let **no one** hold you down, as men using snares do a bird.’ RV 3.45.1c

Forker (2016: 81) states that negative polarity is a prerequisite for such indefinites to assume this meaning. In accordance with this, I have not found an instance where *ká- cid* expresses the meaning ‘no one’ but does not occur in a negative context. According to Dunkel (2014: 450) the indefinite pronoun *ká- caná*, which contains the negative additive particle, occurs more often in negative contexts.

In addition to the functions discussed above, I find a further possible function of *ká- cid* that is not included in the four groups by Forker (2016: 79) and that is not discussed by Briceño Villalobos (2019: 128–164) either, namely that of a non-specific indefinite that does not express free-choice. This function may be present in the following text passage:

(105) *vayám* *u* *tvām* *apūrviya* / *sthūrám*
 1PL.NOM PRT 2SG.ACC unprecedented:VOC.SG.M massive:ACC.SG.N
ná *kác* *cid* *bháranto*
 like what:ACC.SG.N PRT carry:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.PL.M
avasyávaḥ / *vāje* *citrám* *havāmahe*
 seeking.help:NOM.PL.M contest:LOC.SG.M brilliant:ACC.SG.M call:MID.1PL

⁹⁹ Notice that ex. (102) is not included in his corpus.

‘O you without precedent—we, seeking help like people carrying **something** massive, call upon you, the brilliant, in the prize contest.’ RV 8.21.1

According to Haspelmath (1997: 41), “ambiguity [between specific and non-specific indefinites] can [...] be found in distributive contexts, for example in the indefinite object NP when the subject is marked as distributive-key”. He gives the following Lithuanian example:

- (106) a. *Visi kaž-ką skaitė.*
 all INDF-what read
 ‘Everybody is reading something [specific].’
- b. *Visi ką nors skaitė.*
 all what INDF read
 ‘Everybody is reading something [non-specific].’

Haspelmath explains that in the b. sentence, there is not one single book that everybody is reading but that each person may be reading a different one so that the object is non-specific. In contrast, he regards the object of the a. sentence as specific because there is one single book that is being read by each person. As a result, different pronouns are used in Lithuanian whereas in English *something* can have both readings. The Vedic ex. (105) is syntactically different. The indefinite nominal expression *sthūrám kád cid* ‘something heavy’ is the object of the entity-denoting participle *bhárantas* ‘carrying (ones)’, which is in the nominative plural and is part of a simile. Moreover, there is no overt marking for distributivity. Nonetheless, both readings of the indefinites are possible here as well. The expression *sthūrám kád cid bhárantas* can refer to a group of people who carry one massive thing together (specific) or it can refer to a group of people each of whom carries a different massive thing (non-specific). A translation along the lines of ‘like people who carry whatever is massive’ does not make sense here, so that a free-choice reading is not present here. Thus, even though this passage is ambiguous, it cannot be excluded that *kád cid* can function as a non-specific indefinite that does not express free-choice.

In addition to this potential additional function, there is one text passage in which Jamison & Brereton (2014) assign an approximative meaning to *ké cid*:

- (107) *ābhogáyam* *prá* *yád* *ichánta* *aítana* /
 daily.bread:ACC.SG.N LP when search:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.PL.M go:IPRF.2PL
- ápākāḥ* *prāñco* *máma* *ké*
 not.naïve:NOM.PL.M towards.front:NOM.PL.M 1SG.GEN who:NOM.PL.M
- cid* *āpáyaḥ* / *saúdhanvanāsaś* *caritásya*
 PRT friend:NOM.PL.M son.of Sudhanvan:VOC.PL.M going:GEN.SG.N
- bhūmánā* / *ágachata* *savitúr* *dāsúṣo*
 fill:INS.SG.M go:IPRF.2PL Savitar:GEN.SG.M pious:GEN.SG.M
- grhám*
 house:ACC.SG.M

‘When, facing front, you shrewd ones went forth in search of your daily bread, **kind of like** my pals, o sons of Sudhanvan, after your fill of roaming you came to the house of Savitar the pious.’ RV 1.110.2

There are different interpretations of *ké cid* in this example. Some translators treat it as a specific indefinite pronoun and translate it as ‘certain’. For instance, Griffith (1896–1897: I, 143) translates pādas a/b as ‘When, seeking your enjoyment onward from afar, ye, certain of my kinsmen, wandered on your way’ (see also Geldner 1951–1957: I, 142). It seems difficult to understand what such a specific function is to express here. Renou (1955–1969: XV, 78f.) regards pāda b as direct speech and interprets *ké cid* as a free-choice indefinite. According to him, one can translate pāda b as ‘I have friends, whatever they are (worth, be it) to the west, (be it) to the east’.¹⁰⁰ The disadvantage of Renou’s interpretation is that he has to supply a verb. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 258) and Jamison (comm.I.2: ad loc.) assign *ké cid* a meaning that deviates from the usual functions of indefinites. They surmise that it has the meaning of ‘some kind of X’ or ‘more or less like X’, i.e. that it is approximative. This function can be reconciled with the notion of indefiniteness (cp. for instance the study on the particle *iva* in Vedic prose by Brereton 1982) but nevertheless I do not find this analysis fully convincing. Firstly, there are no other passages in which *ká- cid* exhibits this function. Secondly, I do not understand what ‘kind of my pals’ is intended to express here, apart from the fact that Jamison (comm.I.2: ad loc.) regards it as “slightly slangy”.

As a result, all the interpretations discussed here are somewhat unsatisfactory. I would therefore like to suggest another one: Agreeing with Geldner (1951–1957: I, 142), who is followed by Witzel & Gotō (2007: 652), Jamison (comm.I.2: ad loc.) observes that “the wandering Ṛbhus seem here to be compared to the poet and his ilk, tramp craftsmen in search of skilled work” and assumes that the referent of *máma* ‘my’ is the poet himself. Accordingly, I surmise that *máma ké cid āpáyaḥ* does not refer to the Ṛbhus but rather is a simile that compares the Ṛbhus to the ilk of traveling poets. Given that the behavior of the Ṛbhus described in a/b is typical of these poets, *ké cid* may be interpreted as a universal quantifier. One may then change Jamison & Brereton’s translation to ‘When, facing front, you shrewd ones went forth in search of your daily bread (like) all my associates (i.e. fellow poets)’. The fact that the simile marker has to be supplied in my translation is not a strong caveat, because this is not unparalleled in the Rigveda. Alternatively, *máma ké cid āpáyaḥ* might be interpreted as an apposition to *ápākās* ‘shrewd (ones)’. Accordingly, one might translate: ‘When, facing front,

¹⁰⁰ ‘j’ai des amis, quels qu’ils (vaillent, soit) vers l’Ouest, (soit) vers l’Est’.

you shrewd ones, all (of whom are) my associates, went forth in search of your daily bread (like) poets'.¹⁰¹

There is in fact another text passage which Jamison (comm.I.2: ad loc.) compares to the one discussed here. This is a difficult passage too, both syntactically and regarding the meaning of the indefinite pronoun, so that I will discuss it here as well:

(108) <i>té</i>	<i>me</i>	<i>ké</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>tāyáva</i>	/
DEM:NOM.PL.M	1SG.DAT	who:NOM.PL.M	PRT	like	thief:NOM.PL.M	
<i>ūmā</i>	<i>āsan</i>	<i>ḍṛśí</i>		<i>tviṣé</i>		
helper:NOM.PL.M	be:IPRF.3PL	sight:LOC.SG.F		glitter:DAT.SG.F		

'They (seemed indistinct) to me like **who knows who**, like thieves (concealed), but the helpers (then) came to glitter in my sight.'

'Those helpers of mine, like **some** thieves, were a cause of excitement (to me) at their sight.'¹⁰² RV 5.52.12cd

In this example, Müller (1891: 313) assumes that *ké cid* expresses individuated repetition, for he translates *pāda c* as 'They who appeared one by one like thieves'. Even though this seems to be compatible with a distributive meaning of the indefinite, it seems unusual to assume that *ké cid* functions here as a secondary predicate. Since this is not the usual syntactic function of *ká- cid* and the context does not specifically require such a reading, I do not regard Müller's translation as justifiable. A further interpretation that I reject is the one by Wilson (1857: 327) who translates 'some of them, (invisible) as thieves, have been my defenders: some have been (obvious) to view through the light (of life)'. I do not believe that *ké cid* can have a specific indefinite meaning when it is determined by the demonstrative *té*, which renders the expression definite.¹⁰³ More plausible is the translation by Pischel (1889: 225), which I adapt into English as 'they all were to me, (coming as secretly) as thieves, helpers to see the radiance'.¹⁰⁴ According to this interpretation, *ké cid* universally quantifies over plural demonstrative *té* 'they, these'. One possible caveat against this interpretation is that according to Oldenberg (1907: 815–825) the position of *ké cid* immediately before *ná* 'like' suggests that it is part of the simile. However, Pinault (1985 [1986]: 113) revised Oldenbergs findings regarding the position of *ná* and found cases in which the comparandum occurs after *ná*, as is the case in the translation by Pischel. This makes Pischel's interpretation possible, albeit less likely. A translator who regards the indefinite pronoun as part of the simile is Renou (1955–1969: X, 28), although he has to supply some words to the original text, as my English adaptation shows: 'The helpers (presented

¹⁰¹ Similarly Grassmann (1876–1877: II, 111), but with a different interpretation of the indefinite pronoun.

¹⁰² This translation was suggested to me by an anonymous reviewer.

¹⁰³ I also reject the assumption by Ludwig (1876–1888: II, 299; V, 246) and Griffith (1896–1897: I, 520) that *ké cid* is used as an interrogative pronoun and that *ná* is the negative particle 'not' here.

¹⁰⁴ 'sie waren mir alle (so heimlich) wie Diebe (kommend), behilflich den Glanz (= das Glück) zu sehen'

themselves) as (if they were) one does not know who, (as) thieves, (beautiful) to be seen because of (their) radiance’.¹⁰⁵ He (1955–1969: X, 80) assumes that *ké cid* expresses the “caractère indéterminé” of the Maruts, which is compatible with the non-specific use of the indefinite pronoun. The translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 729), which I have given in the example, appears to be of a similar vein. Jamison (comm.V: ad loc.) explains that she regards *ké cid ná* and *tāyávas* ‘thieves’ as two distinct similes, which also is in accordance with Renou’s translation. The syntactic interpretation by Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 349) resembles the one by Pischel, but unlike the latter, Oldenberg regards *ké cid* as a non-specific indefinite that is part of the simile so that he translates it as ‘like some thieves (coming secretly?)’.¹⁰⁶ Similarly to Oldenberg, one can translate: ‘Those helpers of mine, like some thieves, were a cause of excitement (to me) at their sight’. According to this interpretation, *tviṣé*, which can also mean ‘excitement’, is to be understood as positive when one sees the helpers and as negative when one sees thieves.¹⁰⁷

In one text passage, the NOM/ACC.SG.N form *kád cid* is used adverbially. This does not seem too surprising, because also the demonstrative pronoun can be used adverbially in this form (Delbrück 1888: 216–219). Nevertheless, the meaning of the adverbial *kád cid* is not clear:

(109) <i>á</i>	<i>manyethām</i>	<i>á</i>	<i>gataṃ</i>	<i>kác</i>	<i>cid</i>
LP	think:IMP.MID.2DU	LP	go:AOR.IMP.2DU	what:ACC.SG.N	PRT
<i>évair</i>	/	<i>viśve</i>	<i>jánāso</i>	<i>aśvínā</i>	
way:INS.PL.M		all:NOM.PL.M	people:NOM.PL.M	Aśvin:ACC.DU.M	
<i>havante</i>					
call:MID.3PL					

‘Turn your thought here, come here **somehow** in your usual way—all peoples call upon the Aśvins’ RV 3.58.4ab

In this text passage, *kác cid* is clearly not used as a neuter pronoun in one of the functions described above because the verb *gam-* ‘go’ is intransitive and the goal of the movement is already overtly expressed by the local particle *á* ‘here’. Thus, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 549), as well as Renou (1955–1969: XVI, 33),¹⁰⁸ regard *kád cid* as a modal adverb. This would be parallel to the employment of property-denoting nominals, whose ACC.SG.N form can be used as a modal adverb. Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 101) and Griffith (1896–1897: I, 385) interpret the adverbial accusative differently. Grassmann translates it as ‘always’ (‘stets’) and Griffith

¹⁰⁵ ‘Eux les auxiliaires ils se sont (présentés) comme (s’ils étaient) on ne sait qui, (comme) des voleurs, (beaux) à voir pour (leur) éclat’.

¹⁰⁶ ‘die waren mir, wie irgend welche Diebe (heimlich kommend?), die Helfer beim Anblick zum Glanz’.

¹⁰⁷ I owe this interpretation to an anonymous reviewer.

¹⁰⁸ “*kác cid* porte soit sur le verbe (« de quelque façon que ce soit »), soit sur *évaiḥ*”.

translates it as ‘for ever’.¹⁰⁹ In doing so, they appear to assume the accusative to express temporal extension (see Gaedicke 1880: 175f. and Delbrück 1888: 170f. on this function) and combine this with the universally quantificational meaning of the indefinite pronoun. However, Griffith appears to assume different syntactic boundaries, as he translates ‘Remember us, and come to us, for ever men, as their wont is, invoke the Aṣvins’;¹¹⁰ moreover, he does not render *vísuvé* ‘all’ in pāda b. Yet differently, Geldner (1951–1957: I, 406) and Witzel et al. (2013: 102) render *kád cid* as ‘at any rate’ (‘jedenfalls’).¹¹¹ I am indecisive as to which interpretation is to be preferred here.

Renou (1955–1969: XIII, 134) assumes an adverbial meaning ‘de toute manière’ also for the following example:

(110) <i>vétíd</i>	<i>divó</i>	<i>janúṣā</i>	<i>kác</i>
pursue:3SG +PRT	heaven:ABL.SG.M	birth:INS.SG.N	what:ACC.SG.N
<i>cid</i>	<i>á</i>	<i>śúcir</i>	
PRT	LP	shiny:NOM.SG.M	

‘He, ablaze right from his birth, pursues **any** (food) whatever from heaven here.’ RV 6.15.1cd

Geldner (1951–1957: II, 106f.) assigns *kád cid* the meaning of a temporal accusative and *divás*, which also means ‘day’ and can also be a genitive, the role of a genitive attribute. Hence, he renders *divás kád cid* as ‘at any time of the day’.¹¹² Renou (1955–1969: XIII, 134) does not believe that *divás* and *kád cid* constitute one expression so that he prefers to translate the indefinite as ‘de toute manière’ and *divás* as an ablative.¹¹³ Jamison (comm.VI.1: ad loc.) rejects both interpretations. As Jamison & Brereton’s (2014: 789) translation in ex. (110) shows, it is not necessary to interpret the indefinite form as adverbial at all, but it can unproblematically be interpreted as the direct object of the clause (see also Dōyama & Gotō 2022: 31). Briceño Villalobos (2019: 134) follows their translation. Nevertheless, Jamison (comm.VI.1: ad loc.) revises Jamison & Brereton’s translation and emends it to ‘Just he, blazing from birth, pursues any oblation whatever all the way to heaven’. Yet, even though she supplies ‘oblation’ instead of ‘food’, this does not change their interpretation of *kád cid* as the direct object of the clause, which I consider to be the most plausible one.

¹⁰⁹ ‘Gedenkt an uns und kommet stets in Eile; euch Ritter rufen alle Menschenkinder’ (Grassmann).

¹¹⁰ Similarly Ludwig (1876–1888: I, 50), but with an unwarranted assumption of a subclause: ‘nemt rücksicht, komt, wenn imer die menschen alle nach ihrer weise die Aṣvinâ rufen’; see also Ludwig (1876–1888: V, 583f.).

¹¹¹ ‘Denket her, kommet jedenfalls gern her – alle Leute rufen die Aśvin an’ (Geldner); ‘Denkt her, kommt jedenfalls nach (euren) Bräuchen her – alle Leute rufen die Aśvins an’ (Witzel et al.).

¹¹² ‘Zu jeglicher Zeit des Tages verlangt er (nach Speise), rein schon bei der Geburt’.

¹¹³ He (1955–1969: XIII, 46) translates: ‘Il s’avance du ciel, pur de toute manière quant à la naissance’.

Regarding its syntactic behavior, the examples I have discussed in this section show that *ká- cid* is attested as the head of a nominal expression and as modifying other nominals. For instance, in ex. (104) *ké cid* constitutes a nominal expression of its own, whereas in ex. (100) *kásya cid* is dependent on *ṛtāyós* ‘pious’. This syntactic behavior is typical of nominals in Vedic Sanskrit (cf. Reinöhl 2016: 41). Ex. (109) shows that like nominals *ká- cid* can also be used adverbially when it occurs in the accusative singular neuter. However, the exact meaning of this adverb is not clear.

Having determined the basic functions and syntactic behavior of *ká- cid*, I would like to discuss two further special cases. The first of these is the following example:

(111) <i>divó</i>	<i>róhāṃsi</i>	<i>aruhat</i>	<i>pṛthivyā́</i>	/
heaven:GEN.SG.M	height:ACC.PL.N	climb:AOR.3SG	earth:GEN.SG.F	
<i>árāmat</i>	<i>patáyat</i>	<i>kác</i>	<i>cid</i>	
stop:CAUS.AOR.3SG	fly:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.SG.N	what:ACC.SG.N	PRT	
<i>ábhvam</i>				
formless:ACC.SG.N				

‘He has mounted the heights of heaven, of earth; he has brought to rest **whatever** is flying, **even** the formless [=wind].’ RV 6.71.5cd

Jamison (comm.VI.2: ad loc.) assumes “that the *cid* in the phrase *kác cid ábhvam* is doing double duty: expressing both ‘(what)ever’ and ‘even’”. She follows Renou (1955–1969: XV, 27f.) who surmises that *ábhvam* ‘formless’ refers to the wind. Syntactically, *ábhvam* is then interpreted as an inclusive apposition of the nominal expression *patáyat kác cid* ‘all flying (things)/any flying (thing)’; for it picks out the wind as one entity within the set of flying things (cf. Quirk et al. 1985 [2008]: 1308). Among the things that fly, the wind is an especially unlikely candidate to be put to rest, so that *cid* may be interpreted as a scalar additive. This interpretation is especially plausible because “[t]he old Vedic texts uniformly characterize the movement of both the waters and the wind as unceasing, never stopping” (Insler 1974: 119). Nevertheless, it is not certain because different syntactic functions might be assigned to the nominals in pāda d (see e.g. the translation by Geldner 1951–1957: II, 174). Another caveat is that additive *cid* usually (but not always!) occurs after the word it is associated with (see Section 4.1).

The second case to which I would like to draw attention (as does Delbrück 1893–1900: I, 513) is the following text passage, in which *ká- cid* occurs together with the indefinite pronoun *sama-*:

(112) <i>rákṣā</i>	<i>sú</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>áraruṣaḥ</i>	/
protect:IMP.2SG	PRT	1PL.ACC	non-giver:ABL.SG.M	
<i>svanát</i>	<i>samasya</i>	<i>kásya</i>	<i>cit</i>	/
sound:ABL.SG.M	INDF:GEN.SG.M	who:GEN.SG.M	PRT	

<i>nidó</i>	<i>yátra</i>	<i>mumucmáhe</i>
insult:ABL.SG.F	where	release:PERF.MID.1PL

‘Protect us well from the non-giver, from the mere sound of **any** such a one, when we have become free of insult.’ RV 9.29.5

Following Briceño Villalobos (2019: 136), *sama-* is a free-choice indefinite. Geldner (1951–1957: III, 28) appears to translate *samasya* as a universal indefinite and *kásya cid* as a parenthetical free-choice indefinite (see also Delbrück 1893–1900: I, 513).¹¹⁴ I am not certain as to what the semantic and syntactic relationship between *samasya* and *kásya cid* is, i.e. whether they are to be analyzed as a complex expression or as in apposition. Since this is the only case of this kind, the question has to remain unanswered.

Thus far, I have investigated the different functions of *ká-* *cid*. I will now examine cases in which *cid* occurs with related forms in order to determine whether there are any systematic differences or whether the different functions of *ká-* *cid* can also be observed in those forms. One form with which *cid* also occurs is the demonstrative stem *káya-*, which is attested three times, each in the genitive singular. In all three attestations, it is followed by *cid* and has an indefinite meaning. According to Grassmann (1873: 314), it is identical to *ká-*.

(113) <i>nákir</i>	<i>asya</i>	<i>sahantiya</i>	/
nobody	DEM:GEN.SG.M	conquering:VOC.SG.M	
<i>parietá</i>	<i>káyasya</i>	<i>cit</i>	
vanquisher:NOM.SG.M	who:GEN.SG.M	PRT	

‘**Whosoever** he may be, no one will overtake him, O conqueror (Agni)!’ (Oldenberg 1897: 16)

‘O mighty god, none is the overpowerer of this mortal, **whosoever** he, (i.e. the mortal) may be.’ (Velankar 1960: 5) RV 1.27.8ab

(114) <i>ní</i>	<i>śū</i>	<i>namā</i>	<i>átimatim</i>	<i>káyasya</i>	<i>cit</i>	/
down	PRT	bow:IMP.2SG	arrogance:ACC.SG.F	who:GEN.SG.M	PRT	
<i>téjīṣṭhābhir</i>	<i>aráñibhir</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>ūtībhir</i>			
hot:SUP.INS.PL.F	kindling.stick:INS.PL.F	like	help:INS.PL.F			

‘Bow down the arrogance **of every** (rival) with your help like piercingly hot kindling sticks’ RV 1.129.5ab

(115) <i>té</i>	<i>hí</i>	<i>śmā</i>	<i>vanúṣo</i>	<i>náro</i>	/
DEM:NOM.PL.M	for	PRT	devoted:GEN.SG.M	man:NOM.PL.M	
<i>abhímātim</i>	<i>káyasya</i>	<i>cit</i>	/	<i>tigmám</i>	
hostility:ACC.SG.F	who:GEN.SG.M	PRT		sharp:ACC.SG.N	
<i>ná</i>	<i>kṣódaḥ</i>	<i>pratighnánti</i>	<i>bhūrṇayaḥ</i>		
like	surge:ACC.SG.N	LP.hit:3PL	wild:NOM.SG.F		

¹¹⁴ ‘Behüte uns vor dem Schnauben eines jeden Geizhalses, wer er auch sei’ (Geldner).

‘For these superior men strike against the hostility of **any** zealot, like roiling (rivers) their sharp surge.’ RV 8.25.15

In the first example, the syntactic function, gender and referent of *káyasya cid* is unclear. As in the translation by Oldenberg, it has mostly been interpreted as agreeing with the demonstrative *asya*, the object of the agent noun *paryetá* ‘overtaker’. However, Jamison (comm.I.1: ad loc.) objects that “the person in question has already been defined as a client of Agni’s, and so an indefinite seems odd in context”. Accordingly, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 126) translate ‘No one will circumscribe anything of his, o overpowering one’ and assume that *káyasya cid* refers to the possessions of this client (Jamison comm.I.1: ad loc.) and constitutes the genitive attribute of *asya*. In my opinion, this interpretation is possible but I do not regard it as necessary, considering what is said in the preceding stanza:

(116) <i>yám</i> REL:ACC.SG.M	<i>agne</i> Agni:VOC.SG.M	<i>pṛtsú</i> battle:LOC.PL.F	<i>mártiyam</i> mortal:ACC.SG.M	/
<i>ávā</i> help:SBJV.2SG	<i>vájješu</i> prize:LOC.PL.M	<i>yám</i> REL:ACC.SG.M	<i>junáh</i> spur.on:SBJV.2SG	/
<i>sá</i> DEM:NOM.SG.M	<i>yántā</i> holder:NOM.SG.M	<i>śásvatīr</i> perpetual:ACC.PL.F		
<i>íṣaḥ</i> refreshment:ACC.PL.F				

‘The mortal whom you will help in battles, o Agni, whom you will spur on to the prizes, he will hold fast to unfailing refreshments.’ RV 1.27.7

This is the stanza in which, according to Jamison (comm.I.1: ad loc.), Agni’s client is defined. As I will briefly discuss in Section 4.6.2.1, relative clauses like the ones in *pādas* a and b can be interpreted as universal concessive conditional clauses even without an overt marking like reduplication or the additive particle *cid* (Lühr 1997: 57). Hence, one can translate this stanza as ‘Whatever mortal you will help in battles ..., he will hold fast to unfailing refreshments’. This interpretation implies that this stanza does not refer to a specific mortal but, on the contrary, that the identity of the mortal is irrelevant. This renders *káyasya cid* in ex. (113) explicable because it is simply another formal means of expressing the irrelevance of the identity again. Notice that even the English translation by Jamison & Brereton of ex. (116) may well be paraphrased as ‘Any mortal whom you will help ... will hold fast to unfailing refreshments’. If this interpretation, which I prefer, is correct this passage, because of the presence of *asya*, is comparable to ex. (101) and *káyasya cid* is a clear case of a free-choice indefinite. See on this matter especially the translation and comment by Velankar (1960: 5f.), who explicitly identifies the referent of *asya* with the mortal from ex. (116).¹¹⁵ According to

¹¹⁵ He translates: “O mighty god, none is the overpowerer of this mortal, whosoever he, (i.e. the mortal) may be’.

the interpretation by Jamison & Brereton, it is also probably a free-choice indefinite. As for the form of the interrogative pronoun, Etter (1985: 33–35) surmises that *káyasya* might constitute a metrically conditioned irregular variant (“eine – metrisch bedingte – Entgleisung”), which occurred in one of the examples above and then influenced the others.

The indefinite pronoun in ex. (114) is part of the object of an imperative expressing a command or request and therefore to be interpreted as a universal quantifier. As I have already mentioned above, free-choice indefinites are according to Haspelmath (1997: 49f.) unlikely to occur with imperatives when these are actual commands and not permissions. The speaker wants the addressee to bow down the arrogance of rivals and the most plausible assumption in such a context is that he wants him to bow down the arrogance of every rival and not just of those which may be convenient for the addressee. Briceño Villalobos (2019: 141) acknowledges that *káya- cid* can function as a universal quantifier too.

The last of the three passages is ambiguous. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1082) translate *káyasya cid* as the free-choice indefinite ‘any’. This is justifiable because this passage can be understood as a generic statement, which allows for the presence of a free-choice indefinite (Haspelmath 1997: 50f.). Nevertheless, a universally quantifying interpretation is equally possible, as for instance the translation by Griffith (1896–1897: II, 160) shows: ‘Because these warring Heroes stay the enmity of every foe, As the fierce water-flood repels the furious ones’ (see also Geldner 1951–1957: II, 334).

The analysis of exx. (113)–(115) shows that the functions of *káyasya cid* do not appear to differ from those of *ká- cid*. It is used both as a universal quantifier and as a free-choice indefinite pronoun. However, whether it may also occur within the scope of negation and as a specific indefinite pronoun cannot be answered due to the low number of attestations.

In addition to the simple interrogatives *ká-* and *káya-*, *cid* can also be combined with derived forms, viz. with *káti-* ‘how many?’ and *katithá-* ‘the how-many-eth?’ (see also Briceño Villalobos 2019: 136). The following examples are the only attestations of these types:

- (117) *úd* *vācam* *īráyati* *hinváte* *matí* /
 LP voice:ACC.SG.F raise:3SG speed.on:MID.3PL thought:INS.SG.F
- puruṣtútásya* *káti* *cit* *paripríyaḥ*
 praised.by.many:GEN.SG.M how.many:NOM.PL.M PRT dear:NOM.PL.M
- ‘When he raises his voice, the circle of friends of the one praised by many—**however many they are**—speed him on with their thought.’ RV 9.72.1cd
- (118) *tádbandhuḥ sūrīr diví te dhiyaṃdhá / nábhānédiṣṭho rapati prá vénan / sá no nábhīḥ paramā asyá vā gha /*
- ahám* *tát* *paścā* *katithás* *cid*
 1SG.NOM DEM:ACC.SG.N behind how.many-eth:NOM.SG.M PRT

āsa

be:PERF.1SG

‘The patron whose lineage this is, setting your insight in heaven, Nābhānediṣṭha [/nearest to the navel], murmurs as he quests: “Is this navel of ours highest or is his? I was the **so-many-eth** after that one.”’ RV 10.61.18

In addition to pronominal forms, *cid* also occurs with interrogative adverbs, rendering those indefinite (Thumb & Hauschild 1958–1959: II, 151; Briceño Villalobos 2019: 161f.). These adverbs are *kārhi* ‘when?’ (2 times), *kadā́* ‘id.’ (2 times), *kútas* ‘from where?’ (2 times), *kútra* ‘where (to)’ (3 times), *kúha* ‘where?’ (2 times) *katidhā́* ‘how many times?’ (1 time):

(119) <i>ásvinā</i>	<i>yád dha</i>	<i>kārhi</i>	<i>cid</i>	/	<i>chuśrūyātam</i>
Aśvin:VOC.DU.M	when PRT	when PRT			hear:PERF.OPT.2DU
<i>imám</i>	<i>hávam</i>	/	<i>vásvīr</i>	<i>ū</i>	<i>śú</i>
DEM:ACC.SG.M	call:ACC.SG.M		good:NOM.PL.F	PRT	PRT
<i>vām</i>	<i>bhújah</i>				
2PL.DAT	enjoyment:NOM.PL.F				

‘If you happen to hear this call of ours **at any time**, Aśvinā, (please know that) feasts that are offered to you (by us) are rich’ (Velankar 2003: 119)¹¹⁶ RV 5.74.10a–c

(120) <i>indrāsomā</i>	<i>duṣkṛte</i>	<i>mā</i>	<i>sugám</i>	
Indra.Soma:VOC.DU.M	evildoer:DAT.SG.M	NEG	good.passage:NOM.SG.N	
<i>bhūd</i>	/ <i>yó</i>	<i>naḥ</i>	<i>kadā́ cid</i>	<i>abhidāsati</i>
become:AOR.INJ.3SG	REL:NOM.SG.M	1PL.ACC	when PRT	LP.hurt:3SG
<i>druhā́</i>				
deceit:INS.SG.F				

‘Indra and Soma, let there be no good passage for the evildoer who with his deceit **ever** shows hostility against us.’ RV 7.104.7cd

(121) <i>tám</i>	<i>agním</i>	<i>áste</i>	<i>vásavo</i>	<i>ní</i>
DEM:ACC.SG.M	Agni:ACC.SG.M	home:LOC.SG.N	good:NOM.PL.M	LP
<i>ṛṇvan</i>	/	<i>supraticákṣam</i>	<i>ávase</i>	<i>kútaś cid</i>
move:INJ.3PL		beautiful:ACC.SG.M	help:DAT.SG.N	where PRT

‘To give help **anywhere**, the good (gods) installed in the home Agni, beautiful to look upon’ RV 7.1.2ab

(122) <i>kútrā</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>yásya</i>	<i>sámṛtau</i>	/
where	PRT	REL:GEN.SG.M	encounter:LOC.SG.F	
<i>raṇvā́</i>	<i>náro</i>	<i>nṛśádane</i>		
delighting:NOM.PL.M	man:NOM.PL.M	session.of.men:LOC.SG.N		

‘At the encounter together with whom, **wherever it be**, delighting men [=priests] (unite) in the session of men [=the sacrifice]’ RV 5.7.2ab

(123) <i>amī́</i>	<i>yá</i>	<i>ṛkṣā</i>
DEM:NOM.PL.M	REL:NOM.PL.M	bear:NOM.PL.M

¹¹⁶ Jamison & Brereton (2014: 757) translate pādas a/b as ‘Aśvins, when you should hear this call anywhere’.

nīhitāsa *uccā́* / *náktam* *dádr̥śre*
 LP.put:PPP.NOM.PL.M high night:ACC.SG.F appear:PERF.MID.3PL

kúha *cid* *díveyuḥ*
 where PRT at.day+go:PERF.3PL

‘Yonder Bears [=stars of Ursa Major], set on high, are visible at night; they have gone **somewhere else** by day.’ RV 1.24.10ab

(124) *tuvám* *agne* [...] / [...] *devánām* *pári*
 2SG.NOM Agni:VOC.SG.M god:GEN.PL.M LP
bhūṣasi *vratám* / [...] / *dvimātā́*
 strive.after:2SG commandment:ACC.SG.N with.two.mothers:NOM.SG.M
śayúḥ *katidhā́* *cid* *āyáve*
 lying:NOM.SG.M how.many.times PRT Āyu:DAT.SG.M

‘You, Agni, [...] tend to the commandment of the gods, [...] having (just) two mothers, lying down **in so many places** for Āyu.’ RV 1.31.2

In addition to these collocations, there is also the indefinite *kú-cid* (attested 3 times), which Grassmann (1873: 332) regards as one single lexeme (cf. Etter 1985: 48):

(125) *kúcij* *jāyate* *sánayāsu* *návyo*
 anywhere be.born:MID.3SG old:LOC.PL.F new:NOM.SG.M

‘**Wherever it may be**, he is born anew among the old ones.’ RV 10.4.5a

There are two passages in the Rigveda in which *cid* occurs after an interrogative proform and this proform is repeated (cf. Wackernagel & Debrunner 1930: 574f.; Klein 2003: 794f.):

(126) *yád* *adyá* *kárhi* *kárhi* *cic* / *chuśrūyātam* *imám*
 if today when when PRT hear:PERF.OPT.2DU DEM:ACC.SG.N
hávam / *ánti* *śad* *bhūtu*
 call:ACC.SG.M LP be:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.N become:AOR.IMP.3SG
vām *ávaḥ*
 2DU.GEN help:NOM.SG.N

‘If today, **at any time at all**, you two should hear this call – let the help of you two become truly nearby.’ RV 8.73.5

(127) *yád* *agne* *kāni* *kāni* *cid* /
 when Agni:VOC.SG.M what:ACC.PL.N what:ACC.PL.N PRT
ā́ *te* *dārūṇi* *dadhmasi* / *tā́*
 LP 2SG.DAT wood:ACC.PL.N put:1PL DEM:ACC.PL.N
juśasva *yaviṣṭhiya*
 enjoy:AOR.IMP.MID.2SG youngest:VOC.SG.M

‘When, Agni, we set **any** pieces of wood whatsoever in you, enjoy them, youngest one.’ RV 8.102.20

As Briceño Villalobos (2019: 163) observes, this construction is used for free-choice indefinites.¹¹⁷ The reduplicated forms might be emphatic indefinites (Haspelmath 1997: 125f.), but due to the scarce attestations I am not able to determine the exact meaning of *kárhi kárhi cid* and *káni káni cid*. From a prosodic point of view, notice that the second occurrence of the interrogative is accented, unlike in an *āmreḍita*, where the repeated case form loses its accent (see section 5.4.2). This has been attributed to the presence of *cid* (Benfey 1852–1854: I, 65f.; Delbrück 1893–1900: III, 147; Wackernagel & Debrunner 1930: 574f.).

This concludes my investigation of indefinites. I have illustrated that *ká- cid* may function as a specific, universal, free-choice, negative, and perhaps also as a non-specific indefinite and that it behaves like other nominals syntactically in that it can function as a head or a modifier and can be used adverbially in the accusative singular neuter. With respect to semantics, I have also shown that other related interrogatives followed by *cid*, be it pronominals or adverbs, express the same meanings as *ká- cid*. In two cases the adverb preceding *cid* is repeated, but the exact meaning of this construction has to remain unclear, similarly to the one case in which *ká- cid* co-occurs with the simple indefinite pronoun *sama-*.

4.3.2 *nū* ‘now’ + *cid*

In addition to the combination with interrogative proforms, *cid* can also occur immediately after the particle *nū* ‘now’. This is attested 25 times in the Rīgveda. There are two additional passages in which *cid* follows the short variant *nú*. The collocation *nū cid* was most recently examined by Klein (2019: 52–54). He distinguishes between two types: on the one hand those cases in which *nū cid* keeps its transparent meaning ‘even now’ and on the other hand those in which *nū cid* has the meaning ‘never’. The second group is especially peculiar because *nū cid* can function as a marker of negative polarity in spite of the absence of any overt negator. There are, however, cases where *nū cid* co-occurs with the negative particle *ná*. As an example of negative *nū cid* without *ná* I give the text passage in ex. (128):

(128) <i>śrávac</i>			<i>chrútkarṇa</i>		<i>īyate</i>		<i>vásūnāṃ</i>	/
hear:AOR.SBJV.3SG			with.hearing.ears:NOM.SG.M		beseech:PASS.3SG		good:GEN.PL.N	
<i>nū</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>mardhiṣad</i>		<i>gíraḥ</i>			
now	PRT	1PL.GEN	neglect:AOR.SBJV.3SG		song:ACC.PL.F			

‘He will listen: he of listening ears is implored for goods. He will **never** neglect our songs.’ RV 7.32.5ab

¹¹⁷ However, he (2019: 144) gives ‘every piece of wood whatsoever’ in the translation of ex. (127).

In this example, it is unlikely that *nū cid* expresses the meaning ‘even now’ because then the second clause would contradict the proposition of the first clause. Rather, one can assume that the speaker has faith in Indra, who is the referent of the subjects, and does not expect him to neglect his songs at any time in the future. With respect to the other group, Klein (2019: 54) identifies only 6 attestations in which *nū cid* can be translated as ‘even now’. One of these attestations is given in ex. (129):

(129) <i>imám</i>	<i>ketúm</i>	<i>adadhur</i>	<i>nū</i>	<i>cid</i>
DEM:ACC.SG.M	beacon:ACC.SG.M	put:IPRF.3PL	now	PRT
<i>áhnām</i>				
day:GEN.PL.N				

‘This one (viz. soma) have they set for a beacon of the days **even now**’¹¹⁸ RV 6.39.3c

Klein (2019: 54) explains that although ‘even now’ is the most literal interpretation of positive *nū cid*, “one can add nuance to this reading in individual instances”. With respect to the example given here, he follows Geldner (1951–1957: II, 135) and assumes that it is meant to convey that Soma will be the beacon forever.

The crucial question that remains to be answered is why *nū cid* can mark negative polarity although it exhibits no overt negative morpheme. Renou (1955–1969: I, 65) assumes that in this collocation *nū* itself can have a negative meaning (cf. Persson 1893: 251). In Renou’s opinion, passages in which *nū* and the negator *ná* co-occur are, at least synchronically, pleonastic. This is in accordance with Dunkel (1982–1983: 199), who regards *nū* in the collocation *nū cid* as a reflex of “a by-form **nu*” of the negative **nó*.¹¹⁹ However, this view is controversial. Oldenberg (1909–1912: II, 66) denies the existence of a negative *nū* that is not followed by *cid* and also Klein (2019) mentions no such cases. Böhtlingk & Roth (1855–1875: IV, 299) give two Rigvedic passages of an alleged negative *nū*, the first of which is the following one:

(130) <i>nū</i>	<i>anyátrā</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>adrivas</i>	/	<i>tuván</i>	<i>no</i>
now	elsewhere	PRT	with.stone:VOC.SG.M		2SG.ABL	1PL.GEN
<i>jāgmur</i>	<i>āśásaḥ</i>					
go:PERF.3PL	wish:NOM.PL.F					

‘**Never** have our hopes gone to any other place than you, o master of the stones.’ RV 8.24.11ab

As Renou (1955–1969: XV, 41) remarks, this text passage contains *cid* in addition to *nū*, albeit not in an adjacent position. This may be extraordinary but Klein (2019: 53) analyzes this as a special case of *nū cid*, where “the collocation *nū cid* has been split up by a contextually

¹¹⁸ The translation is adopted from Klein (2019: 54); he uses italics instead of boldface type.

¹¹⁹ Compare Dunkel’s (2014: 584) reconstructs **nú-h*₁ and **nú k[#]o/i-*, which he sees reflected in *nū cid*. He (2014: 585f.) regards **nú* ‘never’ as “eine semantisch spezialisierte Suppletivvariante von 1. **né* ‘nicht’ [...] oder eher vom noch älteren 2. **nó*”.

prominent word”. What corroborates Klein’s analysis is the fact that *cid* does not seem to have any of its other usual functions here. If *nú* were a negative particle, this would be an environment where scale reversal usually occurs. This would mean that *anyátrā* ‘elsewhere’ would be marked as likely. However, this does not seem to be the case. As a likely alternative I would expect something like ‘Never have our hopes gone so much as one step away from you’. In Section 4.4, I will argue that *cid* has a ‘totalizing’ function when it occurs after *anyátas* ‘from the others’ in ex. (162), but it does not have this function after *anyátrā* in ex. (130). I also argue that *cid* alone cannot have the function of a free-choice quantifier, which might be a tempting assumption in this case. I therefore follow Klein (2019), who interprets ex. (130) as another instance of *nú cid* and therefore gives 26 as the total number of attestations of *nú cid* in the Rigveda. The second passage that Böhtlingk & Roth (1855–1875: IV, 299) give for negative *nú* is the following one:

(131) <i>nú</i>	<i>mártio</i> ^o	<i>dayate</i>	<i>saniṣyán</i>	/
now	mortal:NOM.SG.M	divide:MID.3SG	gain:PTCP.FUT.ACT.NOM.SG.M	
<i>yó</i>		<i>viṣṇava</i>	<i>urugāyāya</i>	
REL:NOM.SG.M		Viṣṇu:DAT.SG.M	wide-ranging:DAT.SG.M	
<i>dāśat</i>	/	<i>prá yáh</i>	<i>satrácā</i>	
worship:INJ.3SG		LP REL:NOM.SG.M	complete:INS.SG.N	
<i>mánasā</i>		<i>yájāta</i>		
mind:INS.SG.M		sacrifice:SBJV.MID.3SG		

‘**Now** the mortal desiring to gain gets his share, if he does pious service to wide-ranging Viṣṇu, will set the sacrifice in motion with fully focused mind’ RV 7.100.1a–c

Griffith (1896–1897: II, 94) translates pādas a/b as ‘NE’ER doth the man repent, who, seeking profit, bringeth his gift to the far-striding Vishṇu’. Yet, Renou (1955–1969: XV, 41) remarks that interpreting *nú* as ‘never’ is problematic, referring to Oldenberg (1909–1912: II, 66), and he also remarks that this would be the only passage in the Rigveda with negative *nú* apart from ex. (130), where the assumption of an unusually split *nú cid* appears to be the most plausible solution. Thus, even though Renou contemplates a negative meaning of *nú*, he is skeptical regarding exx. (130) and (131). In the latter example, a positive interpretation is clearly possible. Nonetheless, Renou (1955–1969: XII, 82) observes a negative meaning of *nú cid* and attributes this to the influence of negative expressions that occur before *nú cid*.¹²⁰ Klein (2019: 52) argues in a similar vein. He assumes that the negative *nú cid* is an elliptical form of **ná nú cid* ‘not even now’. He arrives at the meaning ‘never’ by assuming that the scalar particle *cid* marks ‘now’ as a high point on a scale and therefore a clause containing **ná nú cid* implies

¹²⁰ According to Briceño Villalobos (2019: 147f.), “*nu* alone can operate as a negative strengthener ‘ever, at all’ after negatives”.

“that at all other times ‘lower’ than the present, viz. the past, the event or state in question has not occurred. Then by a further pragmatic implication, the future is ruled out as well”. Such contexts, in which *nū cid* co-occurs with another negative element are indeed attested in the Rigveda, as the following example, which both he and Renou give, illustrates:

(132) <i>yásya</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>nū</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>ādísam</i>	/	<i>ná</i>
REL:GEN.SG.M	2SG.GEN	now	PRT	aim:ACC.SG.F		NEG
<i>minánti</i>	<i>svarájiyam</i>		/	<i>ná</i>	<i>devó</i>	
diminish:3PL	sovereignty:ACC.SG.N			NEG	god:NOM.SG.M	
<i>nādhriḡur</i>		<i>jánaḥ</i>				
NEG+irresistible:NOM.SG.M		people:NOM.SG.M				

‘You whose aim, whose sovereignty they **never** confound—neither god, nor the exalted folk.’ RV 8.93.11

The three other examples of this kind are RV 4.6.7, 7.20.6 and 8.27.9. Regardless of the diachronic explanation, from a purely synchronic point of view it is puzzling why *nū cid* is used to encode meanings that are almost the opposite of each other. This is prone to create misunderstandings, especially because there are also some cases in which *nū cid* occurs together with the negative particle *ná*. Thus, in two cases, both of which Klein (2019) does not discuss explicitly, the translators disagree on whether *nū cid* should be interpreted as positive or negative.¹²¹ Consider the following text passage, where Scarlata (1999: 405) and Jamison & Brereton (2014: 865) are indecisive regarding the meaning of *nū cid*:

(133) <i>makṣū</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>yéṣu</i>	<i>doháse</i>	<i>cid</i>	
promptly	NEG	REL:LOC.PL.M	milk:INF.DAT.SG	PRT	
<i>ayá</i>	/	<i>á</i>	<i>náma</i>	<i>dhṛṣṇú</i>	
irrepressible:NOM.SG.F		LP	name:ACC.SG.N	bold:ACC.SG.N	
<i>mārutam</i>	<i>dádhānāḥ</i>	/	<i>ná</i>	<i>yé</i>	
of.Maruts:ACC.SG.N	take:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.PL.M		NEG	REL:NOM.PL.M	
<i>stauná</i>	<i>ayáso</i>	<i>mahná</i>	/	<i>nū</i>	<i>cid</i>
inert:NOM.PL.M	irrepressible:NOM.PL.M	greatness:INS.SG.M		now	PRT
<i>sudānur</i>	<i>áva</i>	<i>yāsad</i>	<i>ugrān</i>		
with.good.drops:NOM.SG.F	LP	beseech:AOR.SBJV.3SG	mighty:ACC.PL.M		

‘Those for whom right away [=right after their birth] the irrepressible one [=Pṛṣṇi] was not even there to give milk—those who, assuming the bold name “Marut,” did not (stand still) like posts, (but were themselves) irrepressible in their greatness. **Even now** [/never] would the one of good drops [=Pṛṣṇi] appease (those) mighty ones.’¹²² RV 6.66.5

¹²¹ In a third passage, RV 1.53.1, Velankar (1948: 22) regards *nū cid* as positive whereas the other translators interpret it as negative. However, I do not find Velankar’s translation convincing, so that I regard this case as negative.

¹²² Pace Jamison & Brereton (2014: 865) I assume that the focus of the first *cid* is *doháse* (cf. Oldenberg 1909–1912: I, 411), so that the translation of pāda a in this example deviates from theirs. Scarlata translates pāda d as ‘just jetzt/(niemals) soll die, die Gute Tropfen hat (die Pṛṣṇi) die Gewaltigen wegbitten’.

This stanza is generally difficult to understand (cf. Geldner 1951–1957: II, 169). One of the difficulties is the interpretation of *nū cid* in the last pāda. Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 294), von Bradke (1893: 121), Geldner (1951–1957: II, 169), Renou (1955–1969: X, 41) and Dōyama & Gotō (2022: 130) interpret it as ‘never’.¹²³ Yet, Scarlata (1999: 405) and Jamison & Brereton (2014: 865) consider a positive interpretation just as possible. Contradictory as this may seem, Jamison (comm.VI.2: ad loc.) explains that owing to the subjunctive mood of the predicate, the outcome of both interpretation would be identical: “even now she is trying to appease them, and she never will be able to”.

Even though ex. (133) suggests that the difference between the meanings ‘never’ and ‘even now’ of *nū cid* might not be as substantial as it seems at first sight, the following example, also not explicitly discussed by Klein (2019), shows that it is in fact substantial:

(134) <i>nū</i>	<i>cit</i>	<i>sahojā</i>		<i>amṛto</i>	<i>nī</i>
now	PRT	born.of.strength:NOM.SG.M		immortal:NOM.SG.M	LP
<i>tundate</i>	/	<i>hótā</i>		<i>yád</i>	<i>dūtó</i>
push:MID.3SG		Hotar:NOM.SG.M		when	messenger:NOM.SG.M
<i>ābhavad</i>		<i>vivásvataḥ</i>	/	<i>ví</i>	<i>sādhiṣṭhebhīḥ</i>
become:IPRF.3SG		Vivasvant:GEN.SG.M		LP	straight:SUP.INS.PL.M
<i>pathībhī</i>	<i>rájo</i>		<i>mama</i>		
path:INS.PL.M	space:ACC.SG.N		measure:PERF.MID.3SG		

‘**Never** is the immortal one, born of strength, forced down. When he became Hotar, messenger of Vivasvant, he measured across the airy realm along the paths that lead straightest to the goal.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 174)

‘**To this day** the immortal who is born of strength has goaded on himself. ...’¹²⁴ RV 1.58.1a–c

Renou (1955–1969: XII, 82) points to the necessity of clarifying the meaning of *nū cid* in this passage. He opts for a negative interpretation because he observes that a negative meaning is attested more often, especially in initial position and with indicative verb forms. In contrast, Witzel & Gotō (2007: 109; 591), who consider both interpretations possible, tentatively opt for a positive interpretation, as is shown in the example. They explain that the choice for a positive or negative interpretation depends on the interpretation of the predicate *tundate*. This is only attested once and its meaning is unclear. Jamison (comm.I.1: ad loc.) remarks that the usual meaning ‘spur on’, which Geldner (1951–1957: I, 74) and Witzel & Gotō (2007: 109) assume,

¹²³ ‘nie weis’ die starken ab der opferreiche’ (Grassmann); ‘nimmer wird sie, die reich an Nass ist, die Gewaltigen erbitten’ (von Bradke); ‘Niemals soll die gabenschöne (Mutter) den Gewaltigen Abbitte tun’ (Geldner); ‘Que jamais un (être) aux beaux dons ne fasse-une-dépréciation (vaine) à (ces dieux) formidables !’ (Renou); ‘den Gewaltigen soll die schön Träufelnde niemals Abbitte leisten’ (Dōyama & Gotō).

¹²⁴ The translation follows Witzel & Gotō (2007: 109): ‘Noch jetzt stachelt sich der machtgeborene Unsterbliche an’. On the question of whether the subclause in pāda b is to be construed with pāda a or c see Jamison (comm.I.1: ad loc.).

does not fit together with the local particle *ní*. Also unclear is the morphological interpretation of this form (Joachim 1978: 85).¹²⁵ Nonetheless, this difficulty of interpretation shows that it is unsatisfactory to assume that *nū́ cid* is simply ambiguous and that the interpretation depends only on the context. Rather, it is a desideratum to identify formal criteria that contribute to the correct interpretation. In the following, I will test a hypothesis according to which the position of *nū́ cid* is the factor which determines its interpretation.

As a starting point, I take the observation that *nū́ cid* tends to occur in initial position when it means ‘never’ (Klein 2019: 53) while it tends to occur in non-initial position when it is not negative (Renou 1955–1969: XII, 82). One might wonder whether these are in fact not only tendencies but strict rules.¹²⁶ As I have already shown by exx. (128) and (130), there are clear cases where initial *nū́ cid* functions as a negator. However, the following passage shows that this hypothesis is false:

(135) <i>yāhí</i>	<i>sūno</i>		<i>sahasō</i>	<i>yāsya</i>
go:IMP.2SG	son:VOC.SG.M		strength:GEN.SG.N	REL:GEN.SG.M
<i>nū́</i>	<i>cid</i>	/	<i>ádeva</i>	<i>íśe</i>
now	PRT		godless:NOM.SG.M	be.able:PERF.MID.3SG
<i>puruhūta</i>			<i>yótoḥ</i>	
much.invoked:VOC.SG.M			keep.away:INF.GEN.SG	

‘Drive, O son of power, whom the godless man is **never** able to keep away, O often called one’¹²⁷ RV 6.18.11cd

Interestingly, Klein (2019: 53) groups this passage together with those in which negative *nū́ cid* occurs clause-initially and merely remarks that the clause boundary does not coincide with the pāda boundary.¹²⁸ He is correct in observing that pāda c contains material that precedes the relative clause. Nonetheless, it is clearly the relative pronoun which assumes the initial position of this clause and not *nū́ cid*.¹²⁹ Thus, initial vs. non-initial position cannot be used as a strict criterion to distinguish the positive and the negative function of *nū́ cid*.¹³⁰

¹²⁵ Aufrecht (1881) even suggests an emendation of this pāda (see also Oldenberg 1897: 46f. 1909–1912: I, 57), which I do not follow.

¹²⁶ Another case in which the syntactic position of an element determines its interpretation is *anyá-* ‘other’. Jamison (1997) finds that it is to be interpreted as indefinite or definite depending on whether it appears clause-initially or not.

¹²⁷ The translation is adopted from Klein (2019: 53); he uses italics instead of boldface type.

¹²⁸ Klein (2019: 53) writes: “In its relexicalized value ‘never’, *nū́ cid* sits, with only two exceptions, in initial position within its clause, which in one instance (28f) [= ex. (135)] begins late in the pāda”.

¹²⁹ In contrast, the two passages in which Klein (2019: 53) does find negative *nū́ cid* in a late position could be accounted for if one tried to argue in favor of the hypothesis. See my discussion below, including footnote 131.

¹³⁰ Another possible factor that Renou (1955–1969: XII, 82) regards as a cue to the interpretation of this expression is the mood of the verb. He observes the co-occurrence of positive *nū́ cid* with imperatives or optatives. Yet, although this tendency does exist, it cannot serve to disambiguate the meanings either, for as ex. (129) above shows, positive *nū́ cid* does in fact occur with an indicative verb. Conversely, the negative meaning occurs with an optative in RV 6.37.3.

Nonetheless, the assumption that the position of *nū cid* disambiguates its function should not be abandoned entirely. What the above examples of negative *nū cid* have in common is that *nū cid* precedes the finite verb. This syntactic behavior is in fact comparable to that of the negative particle *ná* ‘not’. This particle typically occurs in initial position or directly precedes the verb (cf. Delbrück 1888: 23; 541–543, Oldenberg 1909–1912: II, 176, Renou 1946 [1947]: 43–45). As I have mentioned, the initial position is a typical slot for negative *nū cid* as well. In ex. (135), *nū cid* occupies the second position and is preceded by a relative pronoun. This position is also attested for *ná* (cf. Renou 1946 [1947]: 44), as the following example shows:

- (136) *yáthā ná pūrvam áparo jáhāti /*
 so.that NEG earlier:ACC.SG.M later:NOM.SG.M abandon:3SG
evá dhātar áyūṃṣi
 so ordainer:VOC.SG.M lifetime:ACC.PL.N
kalpayaiśām
 be.ordered:CAUS.IMP.2SG+DEM.GEN.PL.M
 ‘so, o Ordainer, arrange their lifetimes, so that the later does **not** leave behind the earlier.’
 RV 10.18.5cd

Here, it is the conjunction *yáthā*, which is based on the relative stem, which occupies the first position. In the remaining two cases of negative *nū cid* in non-initial position, its syntax corresponds to that of *ná* as well:

- (137) *yuṣmákam astu táviṣī tánā*
 2PL.GEN be:IMP.3SG might:NOM.SG.F lineage:INS.SG.F
yuṣjā / rúdrāso nū cid ādhīṣe
 yokemate:INS.SG.M Rudra:VOC.PL.M now PRT LP.be.bold:INF.DAT.SG
 ‘Yours be the might, with your full lineage as yokemate; o Rudras, let it **never** be open to challenge.’ RV 1.39.4cd

- (138) *áthainoḥ kṣatráṃ ná kútaś*
 then+DEM:GEN.DU.M dominion:NOM.SG.N NEG from.where
canādhīṣe / devatváṃ nū cid
 PRT+LP.be.bold:INF.DAT.SG divinity:NOM.SG.N now PRT
ādhīṣe
 LP.be.bold:INF.DAT.SG

‘And so the dominion of these two is not to be challenged from anywhere—their divinity is **never** to be challenged.’ RV 1.136.1fg

In ex. (137), *nū cid* follows a pre-clausal vocative, so that it is actually to be regarded as clause-initial (cf. Jamison comm.I.1: ad loc.). In ex. (138), it directly precedes the predicative

infinitive.¹³¹ Hence, the positions of negative *nū cid* seem to match those in which the negative particle *ná* typically occurs. Based on these findings, I modify my initial hypothesis:

When *nū cid* is negative ('never') it occurs before the predicate; when *nū cid* is positive ('even now' vel sim.) it occurs after the predicate.

As I have mentioned above, the Rigveda contains 26 instances of *nū cid*.¹³² In 4 of these, it co-occurs with *ná*. Since in these cases it is the negative particle which explicitly marks negative polarity, I will not regard them any further. Moreover, I will exclude the ambiguous exx. (133) and (134) for the moment. Accordingly, there are 20 cases left by means of which I can test my hypothesis.¹³³ In 14 cases, *nū cid* marks negative polarity. In 11 of these, it occurs clause-initially and in 3 cases, which I have just discussed, it occurs in non-initial position. As I have argued, all of these cases are in accordance with my hypothesis, so that I consider its first part to be valid. The second part requires a more detailed discussion. In accordance with Klein (2019: 54), I find 6 passages that contain positive *nū cid*. In ex. (129) above and in RV 8.46.11, it occurs after the finite verb. In RV 6.18.8, it follows the dative with which it is to be construed and which functions as an infinitive (cf. Jamison comm.VI.1: ad loc.). These cases are clearly in accordance with my new hypothesis. In contrast, the following two passages appear to be counterexamples to my hypothesis:

(139) *áśrutkarṇa* *śrudhí* *hávaṃ* / ***nū*** ***cid***
with.hearing.ears:VOC.SG.M hear:AOR.IMP.2SG call:ACC.SG.M now PRT
dadhiṣva *me* *gírah*
take:IMP.MID.2SG 1SG.GEN song:ACC.PL.F

'O thou having acute ears, hear (my) call. **Even now** receive my songs' RV 1.10.9ab

(140) *ó [= á u]* *tiyé* *nára* *índram*
LP+PRT DEM:NOM.PL.M man:NOM.PL.M Indra:ACC.SG.M
ūtáye *gur* / ***nū*** ***cit*** *tán* *sadyó*
help:DAT.SG.F go:AOR.INJ.3PL now PRT DEM:ACC.PL.M at.once
ádhvano *jagamyāt*
path:ACC.PL.M go:PERF.OPT.3SG

'These men have come to Indra for aid. **Even now** may he go straightway (to them) upon these paths'¹³⁴ RV 1.104.2ab

¹³¹ Alternatively, one might assume that *nū cid* is under the influence of the negative indefinite *ná kútas caná* 'not from anywhere' from the previous clause, so that this passage is to be treated like those in which *nū cid* co-occurs with *ná*. That the scope of a negator can extend over more than one clause is shown by the prohibitive particle *má* in RV 1.38.5 (cf. Jamison comm.I.1: ad loc.).

¹³² This number includes the one passage with *nū anyátrā cid* but not the two passages with short *nú cid*.

¹³³ One of these cases is RV 7.22.8, where *nū cid* in the same pāda as *ná* but they appear to be part of two coordinated clauses. Since *nū cid* occupies the initial position of its clause, this case is in accordance with my hypothesis too.

¹³⁴ The translation of both examples is adopted from Klein (2019: 54); he uses italics instead of boldface type.

Apparently, these two examples constitute counter-evidence even to my new hypothesis. The sequence *nū cid* occurs immediately after the pāda boundary, which coincides with a clause boundary in these examples. In order to maintain the hypothesis, these cases have to be explained otherwise, which I will attempt in the following. In the beginning of this section, I mentioned that in addition to the 26 instances of *nū cid* (including *nū anyátrā cid*) there are two cases in which *cid* occurs after the short variant *nú*. These are the following, which occur in subsequent stanzas, which are addressed to Indra and Agni:

(141) *tám śiśītā suvrktíbhīḥ / tveṣám sátvānam ṛgmíyam /*

<i>utó</i> [= <i>utá u</i>]	<i>nú</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>yá</i>	<i>ójasā</i>	/
and+PRT	now	PRT	REL:NOM.SG.M	strength:INS.SG.N	
<i>śúṣṇasyāṅḍāni</i>			<i>bhédati</i>	/	<i>jéṣat</i>
Śuṣṇa:GEN.SG.M+egg:ACC.PL.N			split:AOR.SBJV.3SG		win:AOR.SBJV.3SG
<i>súvarvatīr</i>		<i>apó</i>			
with.sun:ACC.PL.F		water:ACC.PL.F			

nábhantām anyaké same // tám śiśītā suadhvarám / satyám sátvānam ṛtvíyam /

<i>utó</i> [= <i>utá u</i>]	<i>nú</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>yá</i>	<i>óhata</i>	/
and+PRT	now	PRT	REL:NOM.SG.M	regard:SBJV.MID.3SG	
<i>āṅḍā</i>	<i>śúṣṇasya</i>		<i>bhédati</i>	/	<i>ájaiḥ</i>
egg:ACC.PL.N	Śuṣṇa:GEN.SG.M		split:AOR.SBJV.3SG		win:AOR.3SG
<i>súvarvatīr</i>		<i>apó</i>	/		
with.sun:ACC.PL.F		water:ACC.PL.F			

nábhantām anyaké same

‘10. Hone him [=Indra] with well-twisted (hymns)—the turbulent one, the “real thing,” worthy of verses. And he who **even now** will split the “eggs” of Śuṣṇa with his strength, he will conquer the waters along with the sun. – Let all the other squirts burst!

11. Hone him [=Agni] affording good ceremonies, the “real thing” really there at the proper season. And he who **even now** is solemnly proclaimed (as the one) who will split the “eggs” of Śuṣṇa, he has conquered the waters along with the sun. – Let all the other squirts burst!’ RV 8.40.10f.¹³⁵

In these two cases, the clauses which contain *nú cid* are clearly positive.¹³⁶ Klein (2019) does not treat these passages in his section that is concerned with *nū cid* but in the section about *nú* in the third position of the clause, where *nū cid* is never found. Without naming the passage in ex. (141) explicitly, he just states the following: “The only other peculiarity in the placement of *nú* is that in two instances it is followed by *cid*; but this could be the result of the influence of the collocation *nū cid*, which we will treat separately”. Moreover, Grassmann (1873: 744–

¹³⁵ As with ex. (129), less literal interpretations of *nú cid* are found for both cases. Thus, Geldner (1951–1957: II, 354) translates it as ‘shortly’ (‘alsbald’). Klein (1985b: 302) leaves *cid* untranslated: ‘and the one who now will split the eggs of Śuṣṇa with his strength’.

¹³⁶ Ludwig (1876–1888: II, 376; V, 299) regards the second instance of *nú cid* as negative but Oldenberg (1909–1912: II, 108) is correct in rejecting this.

747) treats *nú cid* differently from *nú́ cid*, subsuming the former under the group of passages where *nú* co-occurs with other particles and each of them retains their own function. This indicates that *nú cid* is to be treated differently from *nú́ cid*, which I will henceforth assume. More specifically, since the only two attestations of *nú cid* are positive, I assume that this collocation is always used with a positive meaning.

This assumption serves as the basis for my analysis of exx. (139) and (140). For there, I assume that *nú́* is not actually the long form of *nú* but that it is in fact a contraction of the short form *nú* and the particle *u* (*ū*). Following Klein (1978b: 135f.), there are 13 cases in which a written *nú́* is required to be read as *nú u* by the meter. One example is the following:¹³⁷

(142) *nú́* [= **nú u**] *na* *éhi* *váṛiyam* /
 now+PRT 1PL.ACC LP+go:IMP.2SG desirable:ACC.SG.N
ágne *grṇāná* *ā́* *bhara*
 Agni:VOC.SG.M sing:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M LP carry:IMP.2SG
 ‘**Now** come hither to us, O Agni, (**and**) being sung, bear hither the desirable thing’¹³⁸ RV 5.16.5ab

This shows that it is plausible to assume that the particle *u* can follow *nú*.¹³⁹ A further question is then whether there are cases in which an original *u#u* is not only written but also has to be read as *ū*. The contraction *u#u > ū* may be rare in the Rigveda but it is attested in the following two passages:¹⁴⁰

(143) *āsú* ***góṣṭpa*** [= *góṣu úpa*] *ṛcyatām*
 DEM:LOC.PL.F COW:LOC.PL.F+LP fill:IMP.PASS.3SG
 ‘let there be **in**seminating right here in these **cows**’ RV 6.28.8b
 (144) *kṣīrám* *sarpír* ***mádhūdakám*** [= *mádhu udakám*]
 milk:ACC.SG.N butter:ACC.SG.N honey:ACC.SG.N+water:ACC.SG.N
 ‘milk, fresh butter, **honey, and water**’ RV 9.67.32d¹⁴¹

Thus, from a phonological perspective, my analysis of exx. (139) and (140) is still possible. From a syntactic point of view my assumption is also plausible because when *u* and *cid* occur in a clitic chain, *u* precedes *cid*:

(145) *idám* *agne* *súdhitaṃ*
 DEM:NOM.SG.N Agni:VOC.SG.M well.formed:NOM.SG.N
dúrdhitād *ádhi* / *priyád* *u* ***cin***
 badly.formed:ABL.SG.N LP dear:ABL.SG.N PRT PRT

¹³⁷ Klein (1978b: 135f.) reads *nú ū*, but I follow Klein (2019: 48), who reads a short *u*. See also Arnold (1905: 75), who restores *nú ū*.

¹³⁸ The translation is adopted from Klein (2019: 48); he uses italics instead of boldface type.

¹³⁹ Initial short *nú* without *u* is attested in RV 6.49.15 (Klein 2019: 48).

¹⁴⁰ I would like to thank Simon Fries for pointing this out to me.

¹⁴¹ This stanza is not contained in van Nooten & Holland (1994: 452). I have taken the text from Aufrecht (1955: II, 243) but adapted the writing system.

<i>mánmanah</i>	<i>préyo</i>	<i>astu</i>	<i>te</i>
thought:ABL.SG.N	dear:COMP.NOM.SG.N	be:IMP.3SG	2SG.GEN

‘Let this well-formed (thought) be dearer to you than one poorly formed, o Agni, and dearer to you **even** than your own dear thought.’ RV 1.140.11ab

In addition to phonology and syntax, the presence of *u* also has to be justified from a functional point of view. After studying the particle extensively, Klein (1978b: 188–191, 1985a: 52–54) concludes that *u* has two basic functions, one is anaphoric (or cataphoric), the other is conjunctive. Dunkel (1997b) shares the view that *u* synchronically is used both anaphorically and conjunctively (although he strongly disagrees with Klein’s diachronic assumptions). In contrast, Catt (2012; 2014: 71–82) assumes that the main function of *u* is not anaphoric but only to mark the connection of clauses. He furthermore assumes that these clauses do not have to be coordinated. In his reassessment of *u*, Klein (2016: 196–198) generally defends his previous analysis, but also adduces some refinements. Since *u* occurs frequently after coreferential pronouns he considers it “not [to] be anaphoric per se but” to express what he calls “identity focus”. Following Klein (2019: 48), *nú u* occurs in the first position of a stanza or hemistich and conjoins the first group of words with something that appears later. This would be different from exx. (139) and (140), where *nú cid* (= *nú u cid*?) occurs in the second pāda of a stanza and connects it with the first pāda. However, Klein (1978b: 135f.) gives also the following passage as an instance of conjunctive *u* that follows *nú*:

(146) [...]	<i>marutaḥ</i> Marut:VOC.PL.M	[.../...]	<i>śúṣmam</i> bluster:ACC.SG.M	<i>maghāvatsu</i> bounteous:LOC.PL.M
	<i>dhattana</i> put:IMP.2PL	/ [...] /	<i>tokám</i> progeny:ACC.SG.N	<i>puṣyema</i> thrive:OPT.1PL
	<i>tánayaṃ</i> lineage:ACC.SG.N	<i>śatám</i> hundred:ACC.SG.N	<i>hímāḥ</i> winter:ACC.PL.F	// <i>nú [= nú u]</i> now PRT
	<i>ṣṭhírám</i> firm:ACC.SG.M	<i>maruto</i> Marut:VOC.PL.M	<i>vīrāvantaṃ</i> with.heroes:ACC.SG.M	/
	<i>ṛtīṣāhaṃ</i> subduing.enemies.ACC.SG.M	<i>rayám</i> wealth:ACC.SG.M	<i>asmāsu</i> 1PL.LOC	<i>dhatta</i> put:IMP.2PL

’14. O Maruts, confer on the bounteous (patrons) [...] bluster [...]. May we thrive in life and lineage for a hundred winters.

15. Now, Maruts, confer on us durable wealth consisting of heroes, victorious in the clash’
RV 1.64.14–15b

In this example, *nú u* also occurs in the first position of a stanza but here it connects the first hemistich of stanza 15 with pādas a–c of the previous stanza. Klein (2019: 48) revises his analysis and considers *nú* simply as a disyllabic variant of long *nū* (“distracted [nuu]”). However, since he does not offer any explanation why such an interpretation is advantageous

and does not seem to be certain about this matter either, I adhere to his previous analysis.¹⁴² At least I see no compelling reason to assume that *u* preceded by *nú* cannot connect a clause with a previous one.

As in ex. (146), *u* occurs only in the second clause in ex. (139) according to my analysis. However, ex. (140) also contains an *u*, which follows the local particle *á*, in the first clause.¹⁴³ This raises the question of whether a pattern *local particle + u ... particle + u* is attested elsewhere. I find this pattern in the following text passage:

(147) <i>ó</i> [= <i>á u</i>]	<i>śú</i>	<i>ghṛṣvirādhaso</i>	/	<i>yātánāndhāṃsi</i>
LP+PRT	PRT	with.cheering.gifts:VOC.PL.M		go:IMP.2PL+plant:ACC.PL.N
<i>pītāye</i>	/	<i>imā</i>	<i>vo</i>	<i>havyā</i>
drink:DAT.SG.F		DEM:NOM.PL.N	2PL.GEN	oblation:NOM.PL.N
<i>maruto</i>		<i>raré</i>	<i>hí kam</i>	/
Marut:VOC.PL.M		give:PERF.MID.1SG	for PRT	<i>mó</i> [= <i>má u</i>]
				NEG+PRT
<i>śú</i>	<i>anyātra</i>	<i>gantana</i>		
PRT	elsewhere	go:AOR.IMP.2PL		

‘You of ardent generosity, drive here to drink the stalks. Here are the oblations for you, o Maruts. Because I have bestowed them, **don’t** go somewhere else.’ RV 7.59.5

In this example, *u ... u* connects the two commands in *pādas* a/b and d. In the first clause it occurs after the local particle *á* and in the second clause after the prohibitive particle *má*.¹⁴⁴ Notice that as in ex. (146) the two clauses do not follow each other immediately. A parallel that ex. (140) shares with ex. (146) is that the predicates of the clauses that are connected are different forms of the same verb. As the patterns that I assume in exx. (139) and (140) are also found in exx. (146) and (147), I believe that my analysis is correct and that exx. (139) and (140), *nú cid* is a contraction of *nú u cid*. Hence, they do not constitute cases in which positive *nú cid* precedes the predicate. The last example to be discussed seems to be problematic as well:

(148) <i>adyā</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>nū</i>	<i>cit</i>	<i>tád</i>	<i>ápo</i>
today	PRT	now	PRT	DEM:NOM.SG.N	work:NOM.SG.N
<i>nadīnām</i>	/	<i>yád</i>	<i>ābhiyo</i>	<i>árado</i>	
river:GEN.PL.F		because	DEM:DAT.PL.F	dig:IPRF.2SG	
<i>gātúm</i>		<i>indra</i>	/		
way:ACC.SG.M		Indra:VOC.SG.M			
<i>ní párvatā admasádo ná sedus / tváyā dṛ̥hāni sukrato rájāṃsi</i>					

¹⁴² In a footnote, he (2019: 47) states “I write [nuñ] instead of *nú ñ*, because it is not clear to me that in most instances this is anything more than a distraction of the long vowel of *nú* rather than an occurrence of the collocation *nú + ñ*”. Similarly, Arnold (1905: 100) states that “the restoration *núū* is an alternative to *nú ũ*”.

¹⁴³ Klein (1978b: 169) does not believe that *ó* is a sandhi form of *á u* but I follow RIVELEX, where this text passage is mentioned both for *á* and for *u*.

¹⁴⁴ In this example, Klein (1978b: 169) does acknowledge (disyllabic) *óo* < *á u*, but rejects *mó* < *má u*. However, I follow Lubotsky (1997: 334; 1062), who finds both *mā* and *u* present in this *pāda*.

‘Even today, **even now**, this is the labor of the rivers, since you dug out a way for them, Indra. The mountains settled down like (flies) settling on food. By you were the airy realms fixed fast, o you of strong will.’ RV 6.30.3

In this passage, *nū cid* is clearly positive and it precedes the nominal predicate. Nevertheless, I do not believe that it necessarily speaks against my hypothesis. First, unlike in the previous examples, *nū cid* does not occur on its own but as an apposition of *adyā cid* ‘even today’, so that its position is probably influenced by the latter (see also Jamison comm.VI.2: ad loc.). It might even be regarded as parenthetical, i.e. as outside of the actual clause structure, although further prosodic evidence would be needed to confirm this assumption. Second, according to Geldner (1907–1909: II, 93, 1951–1957: II, 129), who follows Sāyaṇa, the nominal expression in pāda a does not constitute the nominal predicate but the subject, while a verb is to be supplied. Adopting this view, one may translate ‘Even today, even now, this labor of the rivers exists’.¹⁴⁵ Hence, if the clause does not contain an overt predicate, *nū cid* can neither precede nor follow it. Since such an interpretation is possible, I do not regard ex. (148) as counterevidence to my hypothesis.

To sum up, among the 20 attestations on which I have based my analysis, *nū cid* is negative 14 times and in all these cases it precedes the predicate. Among the 6 cases of positive *nū cid*, it clearly follows the predicate 3 times, but the 3 apparent counterexamples are explicable too. For 2 cases, I have argued that they are actually no cases of *nū cid* but of *nū cid*, where *u* follows *nū*. In the remaining case, the position of *nū cid* is most probably influenced by the adjacent *adyā cid*, and perhaps it is even parenthetical, and in addition the clause in which it occurs possibly lacks an overt predicate. As a result, I conclude that the position of *nū cid* explicitly marks it as positive or negative: When it precedes the predicate it is negative; when it follows the predicate it is positive. Following this analysis, it is possible to disambiguate exx. (133) and (134). In both cases, *nū cid* occupies the first position of its clause and thereby precedes the finite verb. Therefore, I regard it as negative in both cases.

4.4 *cid* with a totalizing function

In section 4.3.1, I have discussed those cases in which *cid* follows an interrogative proform and together with this proform forms an indefinite, which functions, among others, as a free-choice or universal quantifier. In the literature, it has been claimed that *cid* alone can have this function too (e.g. Benfey 1852–1854: II, 115, Grassmann 1873: 454f., Renou 1952: 376). Gonda (1954–

¹⁴⁵ ‘Heute wie immerdar besteht diese Arbeit der Flüsse’ (Geldner 1951–1957: II, 129).

1955: 281) even assumes that several instances of *cid* should be considered “a regular neuter = Gr. τ ”, i.e. an indefinite pronoun.¹⁴⁶ In this section, I will therefore discuss a function of *cid* that I have identified which appears to be similar to universal quantification, namely a totalizing function. After discussing those cases in which I assume *cid* to have this function, I will turn to the question as to whether this function should be analyzed as actual quantification or not.

4.4.1 Contexts in which *cid* has a totalizing function

In the Rigveda, there is only one passage in which *cid* follows a cardinal numeral. In this passage, the word ‘four’ is used in the context of gambling. It probably refers to ‘four dice’.¹⁴⁷ Nevertheless, the overall interpretation of this text passage is not entirely clear and neither is the function of *cid*:

(149) <i>catúras</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dádamānād</i>	/	<i>bibhīyād</i>	<i>ā</i>
four:ACC.PL.M	PRT	hold:PTCP.PRS.MID.ABL.SG.M		fear:PERF.OPT.3SG	LP
<i>nídhātoḥ</i>	/	<i>ná</i>	<i>duruktāya</i>	<i>sprhayet</i>	
LP.put:INF.ABL.SG		NEG	evil.speech:DAT.SG.N	long.for:OPT.3SG	

‘Let him not love to speak ill words; but fear the One who holds **all** four Within his hand, until they fall.’ (Griffith 1896–1897: I, 58)¹⁴⁸

‘One should fear **even** him who takes four until he puts them down’ (Dunkel 1997a: 15) RV 1.41.9

Lüders (1907: 55–57) explains that the player who has the ‘four (dice)’ wins the game (see also Oldenberg 1909–1912: 1, 42f., Geldner 1951–1957: I, 51f.). Jamison & Brereton (2014: 151) leave *cid* untranslated in this example, so that it is not clear what they assume its function to be.¹⁴⁹ As the translation by Griffith (1896–1897: 1, 58), given in the example, indicates, he appears to render *cid* as English ‘all’. In contrast, Geldner (1951–1957: I, 51) interprets *cid* as a comparative particle ‘like’ (‘wie’),¹⁵⁰ whereas Oldenberg (1909–1912: 1, 42f.), followed by Renou (1955–1969: VII, 99), rejects the view that *cid* has this function here (see Section 4.9 on comparative *cid*). Renou (1955–1969: VII, 99) believes that *cid* is not associated with *catúras* ‘four’ but with *nídhātos* ‘put down’.¹⁵¹ Since this interpretation would be unusual from a

¹⁴⁶ Based on some examples that he gives, I assume that also Holland (2009) believes that *cid* can be indefinite.

¹⁴⁷ Ludwig (1876–1888: I, 109; IV, 98) assumes that the gods Varuṇa, Mitra, Aryaman and Bhaga are the referents, but Lüders (1907: 55) explains that this is incorrect.

¹⁴⁸ Also apart from *cid*, Griffith’s translation is debatable.

¹⁴⁹ Jamison & Brereton (2014: 150) explain that they “recast this vignette into the language of modern card-playing”. Thus they supply ‘cards’ and ‘aces’. Accordingly, they translate: ‘(A gambler) should be afraid, right up till (the cards) are laid on (the table), that (his opponent) may be holding four (aces)’.

¹⁵⁰ ‘Man soll sich (davor) fürchten wie (der Spieler) bis zum Auflegen vor dem, der die Vier in der Hand hat’. His interpretation of this stanza follows Yāska and Sāyaṇa.

¹⁵¹ He assumes that this expresses the sense ‘jusqu’au moment même où l’on jette les dés’; compare, however his translation of this passage in (1955–1969: V, 110): ‘Celui qui tient en mains les quatre (dés vainqueurs) eux-mêmes, qu’on le redoute avant que (les dés) aient été déposés!’.

syntactic point of view, I do not follow Renou. Witzel & Gotō (2007: 79) translate *cid* as ‘selbst’, but they appear to regard something that they supply in their translation as its focus.¹⁵² The translation by Dunkel (1997a: 15), given in the example, is syntactically in accordance with what I would expect of additive *cid*. However, assuming that the interpretation of the game by Lüders (1907: 55–57) is correct, the interpretation of *cid* as a scalar additive seems rather implausible. For if the one holding the four dice is expected to win it is also expected that he should be feared so that he is a likely alternative in the given context. A hint towards the correct interpretation may be given by considering typological data. According to Forker (2016: 84f.), additives that occur with a numeral can express a totalizing meaning in some languages. Following Emeneau (1980), she describes this use “as the totalizing or summing use that indicates that reference is made to all members of the group”. Such an interpretation seems possible in ex. (149) too. Assuming that *cid* has such a function, the translation which is the closest equivalent of such a function in ex. (149) is the one by Griffith, who translates *catúras cid* as ‘all four’. Such an interpretation is further supported by parallels from later Sanskrit: A similar function has been observed for *api*, which, in addition to being a local particle, in later Sanskrit fulfills functions comparable to that of Rigvedic *cid*.¹⁵³ According to Böhtlingk & Roth (1855–1875: I, 306f.), Speyer (1896: 71), Monier-Williams (1899: 55) and Apte (1957–1959: I, 155) and Emeneau (1980: 199f.), *api* expresses a meaning of ‘totality’ when it occurs with numerals (cf. also Gonda 1968b: 191; Hock 1975: 103f.), which matches the function described by Forker and which I assume to be fulfilled by *cid* in ex. (149). In fact, Emeneau (1980: 199f.) uses the terms TOTALIZING and SUMMING, which Forker (2016: 84f.) adopts from him, explicitly for his description of *api*. Forker also gives examples from the Kartvelian language Laz and from Tamil. For further Dravidian additive particles with this function see Emeneau (1980: 210–218). For the particle =*bu* in the Modern Indo-Aryan language Bodo see Boro (2021: 84f.) As for *api*, the totalizing function can be seen in the following text passage from the Manusmṛti (cf. Böhtlingk & Roth 1855–1875: I, 306f.):

(150) <i>asmin</i>	<i>dharmo</i>	<i>’khilenokto</i>	[...]
DEM:LOC.SG.N	law:NOM.SG.M	completely+speak:PPP:NOM.SG.M	
<i>caturṇām</i>	<i>api</i>	<i>varṇānām</i>	
four:GEN.PL.M	PRT	class:GEN.PL.M	

¹⁵² ‘Man muß sich bis zum Hinlegen selbst (der Würfel auf dem Boden) fürchten vor dem, der (möglicherweise) die Vier (Würfel) in der Hand hat’.

¹⁵³ On additive *api* see Speijer (1886: 331f.), Delbrück (1888: 525–527), Macdonell (1916: 215), Hartman (1966: 19–25), Gonda (1968b), Ickler (1971: 31–52), Young (2009) and, especially on the Rigvedic data, Klein (1985a: 210–213) and Schneider (2013b: 28–30). Since this form is also used in Classical Sanskrit I write it without an accent.

‘In this, the Law has been set forth in full [...] for **all** four social classes.’ (M 1.107)¹⁵⁴ According to Emeneau (1980: 200), this function of *api* is only present in Classical Sanskrit. Even though a totalizing interpretation of *cid* is supported by typological data, it is exceedingly difficult to demonstrate its presence in the Vedic data. The presence or absence of totalizing *cid* in ex. (149) would not cause a perceivable difference in meaning, as the numeral itself makes clear that four dice are referred to. Therefore, it seems useful to consider in which contexts a totalizing function is to be expected. According to Emeneau (1980: 200) it “is found in references back to a group once it has been defined, or in reference to a ‘natural’ group (the two eyes, all the gods, the directions, etc.)”. This seems to be the case in ex. (149), because even though it is not entirely clear how the game was played, the ‘four dice’ seem to be a fixed constellation (see Lüders 1907: 55–57, Caland 1908: 127f.). Since a totalizing interpretation in the difficult ex. (149) is supported both by the context and by parallel use of additive particles in other languages, especially by Sanskrit *api*, I consider this the correct interpretation and I will now go on to discuss further cases in which I consider this the most plausible interpretation. The following three examples constitute a difficult group. Here, *cid* occurs after the multiplicative adverb *trís* ‘three times’:

- (151) *yó* *rājāṃsi* *vimamé* *pārthivāni* /
REL:NOM.SG.M space:ACC.PL.N LP.measure:PERF.MID.3SG earthly:ACC.PL.N
trís *cid* *viṣṇur* *mānave* *bādhitāya*
three.times PRT Viṣṇu:NOM.SG.M Manu:DAT.SG.M force:PPP.DAT.SG.M
‘He who measured out the earthly realms three times **exactly**, for Manu, who was hard-pressed—Viṣṇu’ RV 6.49.13ab
- (152) *trís* *cin* *no* *adyā* *bhavataṃ* *navedasā* /
three.times PRT 1PL.GEN today become:IMP.2DU knowing:VOC.DU.M
vibhúr *vāṃ* *yāma* *utá*
extensive:NOM.SG.M 2DU.GEN journey:NOM.SG.M and
rātír *aśvinā*
giving:NOM.SG.F Aśvin:VOC.DU.M
‘Three times today take cognizance of us. Extensive is your journey and your giving, o Aśvins.’ RV 1.34.1ab
- (153) *trís* *cid* *aktóḥ* *prá* *cikitur*
three.times PRT night:GEN.SG.M LP appear:PERF.3PL
vásūni / *tuvé* *antár* *dāsúṣe* *mārtiyāya*
good:NOM.PL.N 2SG.LOC LP pious:DAT.SG.M mortal:DAT.SG.M
‘Three times at night, good things become visible within you for the pious mortal.’ RV 7.11.3ab

¹⁵⁴ I have adopted the text and translation from Olivelle (2005: 92; 400); Olivelle writes the Sanskrit text in Devanāgarī script, but I have transliterated it for the convenience of the reader.

The first example contains the famous motive of Viṣṇu’s three steps, by which he “measured out the cosmic spaces, earth, midspace, and heaven, and provided room for the creatures to live” (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 331). Hence, *trīs* clearly refers to a concept that is widely known, i.e. a context in which the totalizing function is expected.¹⁵⁵ In Section 5.4.1, I will discuss ex. (432), which also contains this motive and in which *íd* occurs after the cardinal numeral *trī-* ‘three’. There, I will argue that *íd* might have the function of a slack regulator, i.e. it emphasizes that Viṣṇu made not approximately but exactly three steps. I am not sure what determines the choice between the two particles.¹⁵⁶

The second example is the first hemistich of a hymn which revolves around a certain number, namely ‘three’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 139). According to Jamison (comm.I.1: ad loc.), “‘Three times a day’ (*trīḥ ... adyá*) opens the hymn, announcing the hymn’s ‘three’ theme and also linking it to the three pressings of (some R̥gvedic versions of) the Soma Sacrifice” (see also Pirart 1995: 53). Ludwig (1876–1888: IV, 22) follows Sāyaṇa, who explains *trīs cid* as *trivāram api*. The adverb *trivāram* means ‘three times’ and following Ludwig, *api* has the totalizing function described above and the whole expression refers to the three pressings. Accordingly, Ludwig (1876–1888: I, 29) interprets *trīs cid* as ‘no less than three times’.¹⁵⁷ Assuming that *trīs* refers to the three soma pressings, *cid* is again found with a concept that is commonly known in the context of the Vedic ritual, which speaks in favor of a totalizing interpretation.

The last example is the most difficult case, because here it is not clear what the ‘three times at night’ refer to. Oldenberg (1909–1912: II, 14) and Jamison & Brereton (2014: 896) surmise that this hemistich refers to a nocturnal rite (Atirātra) but they are uncertain about its exact nature. Ludwig (1876–1888: IV, 369) and Atkins (1950: 30), who is followed by Renou (1955–1969: XIII, 145), believes that *trīs* refers to the tree sacrificial fires.¹⁵⁸ Geldner (1907–1909: I, 63; II 102, 1951–1957: II, 190), who assigns an emphatic function to *cid*, assumes with Sāyaṇa that *aktú-* ‘night’ is used here to denote the day (see also Velankar 1963b: 35). Oldenberg (1909–1912: II, 14) and Jamison & Brereton (2014: 896) reject this, but Atkins (1950: 30f.) translates it as ‘the end of night’ and specifies this as “the time when the morning fires of sacrifice are kindled”. Dōyama & Gotō (2022: 466) think of a student of the Veda, who

¹⁵⁵ This or a similar interpretation probably underlies the translation by Renou (1955–1969: V, 33): ‘Viṣṇu qui non moins de trois fois a mesuré les espaces terrestres, pour l’Homme serré (à l’étroit)’.

¹⁵⁶ Dōyama & Gotō (2022: 102) translation suggests a scalar exclusive interpretation of *cid*: ‘Viṣṇu, der die irdischen Räume mit nur drei (Schritten) durchmessen hat für den bedrängten Manu (= Mann)’. This seems to render the multiplicative adverb *trīs* less adequately than the translation by Jamison & Brereton.

¹⁵⁷ ‘Nicht weniger als dreimal werdet uns heute zu teil, o Navedasâ, ausgebreitet ist euer gang und [daher auch] eure gabe, Aṣvinâ’.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. also Griffith (1896–1897: II, 12).

takes care his teacher’s fire through the night. The fact that the nature of the rite that is probably described in this hemistich remains unknown leaves also the function of *cid* somewhat unclear. In principle, the context allows for a scalar additive reading of *cid*, which is reflected in the translation by Kümmel (2000: 176): ‘Even three times at night, good things become visible...’ (cf. the translation by Ludwig 1876–1888: I, 418 but also his comment in Ludwig 1876–1888: IV, 369; see also Dōyama & Gotō 2022: 165).¹⁵⁹ However, if the ‘three times’ are associated with a specific ritual such an interpretation of *cid* seems less appropriate. Even though the example less clear than the previous two, a totalizing interpretation is possible.

According to Böhlingk & Roth (1855–1875: I, 307), *api* also has the function discussed here after *ubha*- ‘both’ and derived forms. The Rigveda contains one case in which *cid* occurs after *ubhá*-:

(154) <i>ubhé</i>		<i>cid</i>	<i>indra</i>		<i>ródasī</i>
both:ACC.DU.F		PRT	Indra:VOC.SG.M		world.halves:ACC.DU.F
<i>mahitvā́</i>	/	<i>ā́</i>	<i>paprātha</i>	<i>táviṣṭbhis</i>	<i>tuviṣmah</i>
greatness:INS.SG.N		LP	fill:PERF2SG	power:INS.PL.F	powerful:VOC.SG.M

‘You have filled **even** the two world-halves with your greatness, Indra, with your powers, powerful one.’ RV 7.20.4ab

The expression *ubhé ródasī* ‘both world-halves’ refers to a natural couple, which renders a totalizing interpretation of *cid* possible. It might emphasize that Indra has not filled only one of them. Compare also the German expression *alle beide* (literally ‘all both’), which is used in a similar way. However, as can be seen in the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 908), given in the example, *cid* may also have its common scalar additive function here. Since this is the only text passage in the Rigveda where *cid* occurs after *ubhá*-, it remains unclear which function it has in ex. (154).

In addition to numerals, *api* also occurs with a totalizing function after universal quantifiers like *sarva*- (Speyer 1896: 71). Moreover, the additive operator *-um* in Tamil is also used in totalizing function with derived forms of the universal quantifier *ellā* ‘all’ (*-m* is used with non-derived forms): *ellārum* ‘all (persons)’ (Emeneau 1980: 210). A similar function can also be observed for Greek *καί*, as Bonifazi et al. (2016: IV.2, §129) show by the following example:

(155) τὰ		στρατόπεδα		ποιεῖ		μὲν		καὶ
the:NOM.PL.N		army:NOM.PL.N		do:3SG		PRT		PRT
ἅπαντα		τοῦτο·						
all:NOM.PL.N		DEM:ACC.SG.N						

¹⁵⁹ ‘Dreimal sogar des Nachts **zeigen sich** die Güter in dir für den opfernden Menschen’ (Kümmel); his boldface type.

‘The armies do this, **absolutely** all of them: ...’¹⁶⁰ Thucydides 5.71.1

The semantics of such a totalizing use of additive particles after universal quantifiers “can be described as indicating an inclusive relation among the referents and that they form a unified set” (Boro 2021: 85). In light of these cross-linguistic findings, I assume that Vedic *cid* has this function in the following example, where it occurs after the universal quantifier *viśva-*:

(156) *viśve cid dhī tvā vihāvanta mártā /*
 all:NOM.PL.M PRT for 2SG.ACC LP.call:INJ.MID.3PL mortal:NOM.PL.M
asmākam íc chṛṇuhi viśvaminva
 1PL.GEN PRT hear:IMP.2SG all.impeller:VOC.SG.M

‘for although all mortals vie in invoking you, listen only to us, o all-impeller.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 917)

‘for **absolutely** all mortals vie in invoking you, (but) listen only to us, o all-impeller.’ (my adaptation) RV 7.28.1cd

Lühr (1997: 63) contends that *cid* is used in this passage to mark the first clause as a concessive conditional clause. I will argue in Section 4.6.2.2 that this is not the case because according to König (2017: 40), “concessivity is never expressed by an additive marker alone”. Hence, I reject a scalar additive interpretation of *cid* here. In contrast, a totalizing interpretation fits the context very well. ‘All mortals’ constitute a natural group and the use of *cid* seems to enhance the contrast between *viśve ... mártās* and *asmākam*, which is the focus of the exclusive particle *íd*. In one passage, *cid* occurs after the adverbial form *viśvátaś* ‘from everywhere, from every side’:

(157) *dravád yáthā sambhṛtaṃ viśvátaś cid / úpemaṃ*
 quickly like LP.carry:PPP.ACC.SG.M all.around PRT LP+DEM:ACC.SG.M
yajñám á vahāta índram
 sacrifice:ACC.SG.M LP pull:SBJV.3DU Indra:ACC.SG.M

‘The two will bring Indra right here to this sacrifice assembled from every side, as if at a run.’ RV 3.35.2cd

Here too, one may think of *viśvátaś* ‘from every side’ as referring to a natural group, namely “the directions” (Emeneau 1980: 200). In addition to the abovementioned passages, there is another case in which *cid* occurs after *viśva-*. This time *viśva-* is in the singular and has the meaning ‘whole’ rather than ‘every’. In other words, it does not seem to quantify over a set of different entities:

(158) *ásti hí śmā mādāya vah / smāsi śmā*
 be:3SG for PRT exhilaration:DAT.SG.M 2PL.GEN be:1PL PRT
vayám eṣāṃ / viśvaṃ cid áyu°
 1PL.NOM DEM:GEN.PL.M all:ACC.SG.N PRT lifetime:ACC.SG.N

¹⁶⁰ I give here the more literal translation that Anna Bonifazi (via email) provided to me.

jīváse
live:INF.DAT.SG

‘For (our friendship) is always there for your exhilaration; we are always there for them [=Maruts], in order (for us) to live a full lifetime.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 145)

‘... that we may live **even** the whole of life.’ (Müller 1891: 64)

‘... that **it is** the whole lifetime **that** we may live.’ (my adaptation) RV 1.37.15

As can be seen in ex. (158), Jamison & Brereton (2014: 145), as well as others, leave *cid* untranslated. Hence, they do not seem to interpret it as an additive particle. In contrast, Müller (1891: 64) translates *cid* as ‘even’.¹⁶¹ The default duration of life was considered to be a hundred years (Geldner 1951–1957: I, 114; cp. also the function of *íd* in ex. (431)). However, humans do not always reach this age as they may die of an illness or fall in battle. Hence, the presence of a scalar additive particle is justified because ‘whole’, i.e. a hundred years, is the highest point on the scale of years a human can live. Nevertheless, since *viśvam* refers here to the default duration of life, one may think of a totalizing interpretation of *cid* here, even though the nominal expression does not refer to a multiplicity of entities. Interestingly, Gonda (1954–1955: 282) remarks that Sāyaṇa explains *viśvam cid* as *sarvam api* (*sarva-* being a universal quantifier), which favors the assumption that *cid* is used in a parallel manner to *api*. Yet, it is unclear as well whether Sāyaṇa understands *api* as additive or totalizing in his comment. A further possible function of *cid* in this passage might be the expression of exhaustive focus (cf. Section 4.8). Perhaps the poet wants to convey that he and his associates want to live the whole lifetime instead of a lower number of years.

Viśva- and the adverbial *viśvátas* are not the only type of universal quantifier with which *cid* appears. In one passage, *cid* occurs after an *āmreḍita*, a reduplicated compound, which in this passage has an iterative meaning.¹⁶² In accordance with Lühr (1997: 62), I will regard iterative *āmreḍitas* as universal quantifiers in Section 5.4.2. Accordingly, one should consider the possibility that *cid* after these *āmreḍitas* can be compared to its use after universal quantifiers, as is the case with *íd*. This would account for the presence of *cid* in the following example, which is otherwise difficult to explain:¹⁶³

(159) <i>á</i>	<i>vām</i>	<i>narā</i>	<i>purubhujā</i>		
LP	2DU.ACC	man:VOC.DU.M	with.many.enjoyments:VOC.DU.M		
<i>vavṛtyām</i>	/	<i>divé-dive</i>		<i>cid</i>	<i>aśvinā</i>
turn:PERF.OPT.1SG		day:LOC.SG.M-day:LOC.SG.M		PRT	Aśvin:VOC.DU.M

¹⁶¹ It is possible that Müller uses ‘even’ not as a scalar additive particle but in a function that has become obsolete, namely as an identifier comparable to ‘exactly’.

¹⁶² On the semantics of *āmreḍitas* see Klein (2003).

¹⁶³ Velankar’s (2003: 95) translation ‘May I turn you herewards, even day after day’ seems not impossible but I prefer the interpretation I will provide below.

sakhīyān

seek.friendship:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.M

‘I would also turn hither you two superior men, who bring many enjoyments—seeking companionship with you, o Aśvins, day after day.’ RV 5.49.1cd

I believe that the context fits a totalizing interpretation because ‘day after day’, i.e. ‘every day’ can be considered a natural sequence and the expression *divé-dive* is attested in all portions of the Rigveda (Klein 2003: 779f.). Interestingly, universal quantification expressed by reduplicated forms like *āmreḍitas* is expected to be distributive (Gil 1995: 334–336), which also appears to be the case in this example. In some languages, totalizing additives yield a collective reading, but in others they can appear in distributive contexts (Forker 2016: 84f.). Consider the following example from the Afro-Asiatic language Amharic by Demeke & Meyer (2008: 621):

(160) <i>be-duro</i>	<i>gize</i>	<i>anbessa-nna</i>	<i>lam</i>	<i>gwadeḥḥna-močč</i>	<i>nebbēr-u.</i>
at-former	time	lion-and	cow	friend-PL	be.PFV-3PL
<i>hulett-u=mm</i>		<i>and and</i>		<i>ləḡḡ</i>	<i>nebbēr-aččew</i>
two-DEF=ADD		one one		child	be.PFV.3SG.M-3PL

‘Once the lion and the cow were friends. Each of the two had one child.’¹⁶⁴

The Vedic data show that totalizing *cid* can occur both in collective and in distributive contexts. In ex. (156), *viśve ... mārtaś* ‘all mortals’ is clearly collective due to the collective predicate *vihāvanta* ‘they vie in invoking’ (see Champollion 2021). In contrast, the *āmreḍita divé-dive* in ex. (159) is probably to be interpreted as distributive.

Quantifiers are not the only elements with which additive particles with a totalizing function may occur. According to Speyer (1896: 71), Sanskrit *api* has this after demonstratives too. In the Rigveda, I count 13 passages where *cid* follows a dual or plural demonstrative but often it is not clear which function *cid* has. In the following passage, in which I consider a totalizing function plausible, it follows the demonstrative *té*:

(161) <i>ṛbhúr</i>	<i>ṛbhúbhir</i>	<i>abhí</i>	<i>vaḥ</i>	<i>siyāma</i>	/
Ṛbhu:NOM.SG.M	Ṛbhu:INS.PL.M	LP	2PL.GEN	be:OPT.1PL	
<i>vibhvo</i>	<i>vibhúbhiḥ</i>	<i>śávasā</i>		<i>śávāmsi</i>	/
Vibhu:NOM.SG.M+PRT	Vibhu:INS.PL.M	power:INS.SG.N		power:ACC.PL.N	
<i>vājo</i>	<i>asmāṃ</i>	<i>avatu</i>	<i>vājasātāv</i>		/
Vāja:NOM.SG.M	1PL.ACC	help:IMP.3SG	winning.of.prizes:LOC.SG.F		
<i>índreṇa</i>	<i>yujá</i>	<i>taruṣema</i>		<i>vṛtrám</i>	//
Indra:INS.SG.M	yokemate:INS.SG.M	overcome:AOR.OPT.1PL		obstacle:ACC.SG.M	
<i>té</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>pūrvīr</i>	<i>abhí</i>	<i>sánti</i>
DEM:NOM.PL.M	PRT	for	much:ACC.PL.F	LP	be:3PL

¹⁶⁴ The glosses are adopted from Forker (2016: 85).

śāsá [...]
command:INS.SG.N

‘2. As Ṛbhu with the Ṛbhus, as Vibhvan with the Vibhus, we would overcome vast powers by your vast powers. Let Vāja help us in winning the prize (*vāja*). With Indra as our yokemate, we would overcome our Vṛtra [=obstacle].

3. Because these **very** ones [=Indra and the Ṛbhus] overcome many (commands) by their command, [...]’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 942)

‘... Because they **all** overcome many (commands) by their command, ...’ (my adaptation)
RV 7.48.2–3a

This text passage is taken from a hymn dedicated to the three Ṛbhus, Ṛbhu, Vāja, and Vibhvan, but it addresses their Master Indra as well (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 941f.). According to Jamison & Brereton (2014: 942), these four immortals are the referents of *té* in pāda 3a. This excludes the possibility that *cid* is used as a scalar additive operator here because it is not unlikely that these mighty characters overcome many commands. A non-scalar additive would not make much sense either because it is not clear what the relevant alternatives would be in this context. Most translators therefore leave *cid* untranslated.¹⁶⁵ Jamison & Brereton (2014: 492) assume that *cid* is used as an identifier (cf. Section 4.8) and translate ‘these very ones’. This interpretation may be plausible but I assume that an interpretation of *cid* as totalizing is even more plausible in this context. Especially in stanza 2, the Ṛbhus are more prominent than Indra. In pādas a–c, each of them constitutes the subject of their respective clause and there is an additional nominal in an oblique case that is etymologically related to their respective name (see Jamison & Brereton 2014: 942). In contrast, Indra is only mentioned as an adjunct in the instrumental case in pāda d. I assume that *cid* is used here to express that all four immortals are intended to be the referents of the demonstrative and therefore serves to disambiguate the pronoun. I will argue in Section 4.6.2.1 that *cid* also has a totalizing function after the demonstrative *tān* in RV 10.154.1–4.

A further passage in which *cid* possibly has a totalizing function is ex. (162), where it follows the ablative of *anyá-* ‘other’ (cf. Grassmann 1873: 1761):

(162) <i>utá</i>	<i>bruvantu</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>nído</i>	/	<i>nír</i>	<i>anyátaś</i>	<i>cid</i>
and	say:IMP.3PL	1PL.DAT	scorner:NOM.PL.F		LP	from.other	PRT
<i>ārata</i>	/	<i>dádhanā</i>			<i>índra</i>		<i>íd</i>
move:AOR.2PL		put:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.PL.M			Indra:LOC.SG.M		PRT
<i>dúvaḥ</i>							
reverence:ACC.SG.N							

¹⁶⁵ Renou (1955–1969: XV, 97) possibly interprets *cid* as asseverative, because he translates ‘Oui, ces (dieux) l’emportent sur les multiples commandements (ennemis)’. Velankar (1963b: 115) does actually translate it as ‘even’ but as I have said, this seems implausible.

‘And let scorers say to us, “You have missed out on the rest in placing your friendship in Indra alone.”’ RV 1.4.5

The first relevant question regarding this text passage is who or what the referent of *anyátas* is. According to Ludwig (1876–1888: II, 5), Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 4), Geldner (1951–1957: I, 5), Renou (1955–1969: XVII, 1), Velankar (1948: 1) and Witzel & Gotō (2007: 15; 490) it refers to material goods. In contrast, Bollensen (1864: 462), Grassmann (1873: 69, 1876–1877: II, 5), Geldner (1907–1909: II, 2), Klein (1994: 109) and, as I understand it, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 93) assume it to refer to other persons, probably the other Gods.¹⁶⁶ Bollensen (1864: 462) correctly observes that there is a contrast between Indra and *anyátas*. Geldner (1907–1909: II, 2; 229) explicitly remarks that he translates *cid* as ‘all’ (‘alle’) or every (‘jeder’).¹⁶⁷ Even though he changes his opinion regarding the referent, he (1951–1957: I, 5) adheres to this interpretation of *cid* in his translation, which is followed by Witzel & Gotō (2007: 15).¹⁶⁸ That *cid* has a totalizing function also appears to be paralleled by *api*, which according to Böhtlingk & Roth (1855–1875: I, 307) possibly has a totalizing function when it occurs after *anya-*. Notice, however, that in ex. (162) *cid* follows a singular form. Following Lühr (2017: 284), *cid* appears to have the combined function of a totalizing and a scalar additive particle. She speaks of a “generalizing *cid* in the phrase *anyátas cid* ‘even of everything else’”. Assuming that *anyátas* refers to goods, this may be a case where the sense of ‘even’ arises secondarily. An additive sense is implied because when one speaks of ‘the other X’ there has to be at least one additional X, as is the case with an additive particle. The scalar interpretation arises through the totalizing function of *cid*, because ‘all other goods’ represents the highest point on the scale of the possible numbers of other goods. If *anyátas* refers to the other Gods, however, an additive nuance of *cid* is not possible. There are only two groups of Gods, on the one hand Indra and on the other hand all other Gods. Since according to pāda c the people sacrifice to Indra, who constitutes the second possible group, ‘the others’ cannot be added to another group that the sacrificers have missed out or deprived themselves of. Hence, the existential presupposition cannot be true and the statement is infelicitous.

In my survey of the Rigvedic data, I have identified several contexts in which *cid* possibly or probably has a totalizing function. These include passages where it follows numerals,

¹⁶⁶ Since *anyátas* is an ablative form, I deem the translation by Griffith (1896–1897: I, 6) incorrect: ‘Whether the men who mock us say, Depart unto another place, Ye who serve Indra and none else’.

¹⁶⁷ ‘ihr habt euch alle (*cid*) anderen (Götter) entfremdet’.

¹⁶⁸ ‘Mögen doch unsere Tadler sagen: „Ihr habt euch um alles andere gebracht, indem ihr nur für Indra euch ereifert“’ (Geldner); ‘Mögen doch unsere Tadler sagen: »Ihr habt euch um alles andere gebracht, nur für Indra (eure) Gunst bestimmend [...]«’ (Witzel & Gotō).

multiplicative adverbs, universal quantifiers, demonstratives and the pronominal adjective *aniyá-*. This function is attested both with collective and with distributive expressions.

4.4.2 Totalizing *cid* and universal quantification

In the beginning of Section 4, I mentioned that *cid* has been claimed to be used as a universal quantifier and this use has been related to the combination of *cid* with an interrogative proform. Thus, Renou (1952: 376) writes that a generalizing function of *cid* spread from its use after pronominals into other contexts (cf. Benfey 1852–1854: II, 115). However, at least from a typological perspective, this does not seem to be plausible. For with respect to forms like those discussed in Section 4.3.1, König (2017: 40) states: “[t]he additive is a component of an indefinite pronoun, but does not imply or denote indefiniteness by itself”. Moreover, in his typological survey Ying (2017: 218–226) finds that only rarely does the same element function both as a (scalar) additive operator and as a universal quantifier in one language. At first sight, the examples that I have discussed in this section appear to contradict these typological tendencies, because the totalizing function essentially expresses that all members of a given set are the referents of the expression that is associated with *cid*. Hence, in most examples, the closest translational equivalent of *cid* in English is ‘all X’. Thus, Konnerth (2012: 212–214) characterizes the “‘totalizing’ or ‘summing’” function of *api* that Emeneau (1980) describes as universal quantification. However, a closer look at the Rigvedic data reveals that in all examples above, *cid* does not actually quantify over a set of referents. On the contrary, from a semantic point of view, the number of referents would in all examples be the same without *cid*. In ex. (149), the quantifying expression is the numeral *catúras* ‘four’, in exx. (152)–(153) it is the multiplicative adverb *trís* ‘three times’ and in ex. (154) it is *úbhe* ‘both’. Similarly, exx. (156) – (159) already contain a universal quantifier apart from *cid*. If my interpretation of ex. (161) is correct, the function of *cid* is to disambiguate the reference of the anaphoric pronoun *té* rather than to quantify over the set of possible referents. Regarding ex. (162), I refer to the study by Jamison (1997) according to which *anyá-* corresponds to the English definite expression ‘the other(s)’ when it occurs in non-initial position. This means that even without *cid* it would be clear that *anyátas* refers to the entire rest of things or gods.

This leaves the question of whether there are other Rigvedic passages in which *cid* can be interpreted as a genuine universal quantifier. Grassmann (1873: 455; 1761) compiles a list of 20 text passages in which he assigns the meaning ‘every, all’ to *cid*.¹⁶⁹ However, in none of

¹⁶⁹ His category 3): “verallgemeinernd in dem Sinne ‚jeder, alle“”. This category does not include the cases in which ‘generalizing’ *cid* occurs after relative and interrogative pronouns and conjunctions.

these text passages is a reading of *cid* as a universal or free-choice quantifier compelling. I will discuss several, but not all, of these examples here:

(163) <i>bādhāsva</i> repeL:IMP.MID.2SG	<i>dūré</i> far:LOC.SG.N	<i>nírṛtim</i> destruction:ACC.SG.F	<i>parācaih</i> far.away	/	
<i>kṛtām</i> do:PPP.ACC.SG.N	<i>cid</i> PRT	<i>énaḥ</i> sin:ACC.SG.N	<i>prá</i> LP	<i>mumugdhi</i> free:PERF.IMP.2SG	<i>asmát</i> 1PL.ABL

‘Far from us, far away drive thou Destruction. Put from us **e’en** the sin we have committed.’ (Griffith 1896–1897: I, 31) RV 1.24.9cd

In this passage, even Grassmann (1876–1877: II, 24) translates *cid* as an additive particle, as do Geldner (1951–1957: I, 25), Witzel & Gotō (2007: 45) and Jamison & Brereton (2014: 121).¹⁷⁰ In contrast, Macdonell (1916: 231) and Renou (1952: 376) interpret *cid* as a free-choice quantifier.¹⁷¹ Macdonell translates this clause as ‘remove from us any (every, all) sin committed (by us)’. Gonda (1954–1955: 281) believes that interpreting *cid* as indefinite is to be “decidedly preferred” to the additive interpretation. I disagree with his analysis because in my opinion an additive interpretation is very plausible. I believe that there is narrow focus on *kṛtām* ‘done’. With Miller (1978: 120), one might assume that the sin that is committed is here a more unlikely alternative to the sin that is e.g. only intended. Bodewitz (2019), according to whom *énaḥ* denotes the evil that results from committing a sin, regards such an opposition as implausible. He (2019: 310) assumes that *kṛtām énaḥ* refers to the result of the sin committed by oneself and the implied alternative is the result of the sin committed by others. He assigns *cid* the meaning ‘even’ in this and similar passages too. Renou (1955–1969: V, 94) changes his view as well and translates it as an additive particle.¹⁷² Similar passages that Grassmann (1873: 455) gives are RV 4.10.7 and ex. (94) in Section 4.4. The following passage has been interpreted in different ways too:

(164) <i>yāḥ pūrviyāya vedhāse nāvīyase / sumājānaye viṣṇave dādāśati / yó jātām asya maható máhi brávat / séd u śrávobhir yújiyaṃ cid abhy àsat // tám u stotāraḥ pūrviyāṃ yāthā vidá / ṛtāsya gárbhaṃ janúṣā pipartana /</i>			
<i>āśya</i> LP+DEM:GEN.SG.M	<i>jānānto</i> recognize:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.PL.M	<i>nāma</i> name:ACC.PL.N	<i>cid</i> PRT
<i>vivaktana</i> speak:IMP.2PL			

‘2. Whoever will do service to the ancient ritual expert and to the newer one, to Viṣṇu together with the Wives (of the Gods), who will speak of his birth, the great birth of the great one, just he will surpass in renown even his yokefellow.’

¹⁷⁰ ‘auch von begangner Sünde mache frei uns’ (Grassmann); ‘Auch die getane Sünde nimm von uns!’ (Geldner); ‘Auch das getane Übel löse von uns!’ (Witzel & Gotō); ‘Release from us even the guilt we have created’ (Jamison & Brereton).

¹⁷¹ ‘éloigne de nous, nous en libérant, le péché commis, quel qu’il soit!’ (Renou)

¹⁷² ‘Le péché, même commis, libère-nous en !’

3. You praisers, carry him to term in the way that is known—the ancient one who is by birth the embryo of truth. Recognizing him, announce his **very** names.’ RV 1.156.2–3c Ex. (164) is extracted from a hymn dedicated to Viṣṇu, who has various identities (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 333). The morphological form *nāma* can be singular or plural but it is probably plural (Jamison comm.I.2: ad loc.). Then, it remains to be answered what the actual function of *cid* might be. Assuming that *nāma* is plural, an interpretation of *cid* as a universal quantifier would be possible: ‘Recognizing him, announce all his names’. In this case, *cid* would be a genuine quantifier, because without it the request might also be understood as ‘announce names of his’. Yet, the translators do not choose this option. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 334), probably following Renou (1955–1969: XV, 38), translate *nāma cid* as ‘the very names’.¹⁷³ Hence they appear to interpret *cid* as somehow emphatic but I am not sure whether this translation reflects any of the functions that I describe in my study. Witzel & Gotō (2007: 282) render *cid* as ‘auch nur’, but I am not certain whether this is intended to be the German beneath-operator or something else.¹⁷⁴ Ludwig (1876–1888: I, 160), who regards *nāma* as the object of *jānántas* ‘recognizing’ translates *cid* as the beyond-operator ‘sogar’.¹⁷⁵ However, even though Viṣṇu’s different identities are an eminent characteristic (cf. also Ludwig 1876–1888: IV, 152), I am also uncertain whether it is appropriate to regard the ‘name(s)’ as a particularly unlikely alternative among the astonishing things one might know about Viṣṇu. Yet, one might think of a non-scalar additive interpretation. Notice that the previous stanza contains another verb of speaking, namely *brávat* ‘(who) will speak’. In this sentence, people are encouraged to speak of his birth while pāda 4c contains a request to say his names. Interestingly, Grassmann (1876–1877: II, 156) himself interprets the particle as additive, so that he must have revised his interpretation of *cid* in this passage.¹⁷⁶ The difficulty of interpreting this text passage and the fact that none of the translations discussed here, not even the one by Grassmann himself, render *cid* as a universal quantifier shows that this interpretation is by no means compelling. Another difficult case is the following text passage from a hymn dedicated to Agni:

(165) <i>yás</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>bhárād</i>		
REL:NOM.SG.M	2SG.DAT	carry:SBJV.3SG		
<i>ánniyate</i>		<i>cid</i>	<i>ánnam</i>	/
desire.food:PTCP.PRS.ACT.DAT.SG.M		PRT	food:ACC.SG.N	
<i>niśīṣan</i>	<i>mandrám</i>	<i>átithim</i>		
LP.sharpen:SBJV.3SG	gladdening:ACC.SG.M	guest:ACC.SG.M		

¹⁷³ ‘(Les) sachant, énoncez ses noms mêmes !’. See also Geldner’s (1951–1957: I, 214) emphatic interpretation ‘Sprechet kundig seine Namen aus!’.

¹⁷⁴ ‘Sprecht, da ihr versteht, auch nur seine Namen aus!’

¹⁷⁵ ‘kennend sogar seinen namen sprach ihr ihn ausz’

¹⁷⁶ He does, however interpret *nāma* as a singular: ‘Die ihr ihn kennt, verkündet seinen Namen auch’.

udīrat

LP.move:AOR.SBJV.3SG

‘Whoever will bring food to you **just** as you seek food, will whet (you) down, will raise (you) up as the gladdening guest’ RV 4.2.7ab

Geldner (1951–1957: I, 417) translates *cid* as a simile marker ‘wie’.¹⁷⁷ However, I follow Jamison (comm.IV: ad loc.) and assume that *cid* cannot have this function (see Section 4.9). Renou (1955–1969: XIII, 4) compromises and supplies the simile marker in brackets.¹⁷⁸ A crucial point that is relevant for the analysis of *cid* here is the syntactic function of *ānniyate* ‘seeking food’. Following Oldenberg (1897: 317), one can interpret it as an attribute or apposition of *te* ‘you’: ‘The man who brings food to thee who art desirous of food, he who stirs up the cheerful guest and rouses him’. In contrast, the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 559) suggests that *ānniyate* is a secondary predicate. In Section 4.6.3, I will argue that unlike in finite clauses, *cid* is used alone as a means to mark a concessive relation between the secondary and the main predicate, although this need not always be the case. If *cid* is used to mark such a concessive relation, the secondary predicate is to be subsumed under the subtype of concessive circumstantials. Due to the presence of *cid*, Ludwig (1876–1888: IV, 308) is eager to establish a concessive relationship between *ānniyate* and *bhārāt ... ānnam* ‘he will bring food’. Thus, he assigns the verb *annay-* the meaning ‘possess food’ instead of ‘seek food’. (see also Griffith 1896–1897: I, 394). However, Ludwig (1876–1888: V, 626) revisits his interpretation and changes his translation of *ānniyate cid* to ‘der du eben speise verlangest’, i.e. an interpretation that is closer to the one by Oldenberg. Nevertheless, as I will argue in more detail in Section 4.6.3, *cid* can also occur with secondary predicates that have no concessive relation to the main predicate, so that it is not necessary to assign a different lexical meaning to *ānniyate* to assume this syntactic function. The participle *ānniyate* may also be a depictive, i.e. express merely a temporal overlap with the main predicate. As the translation ‘just as you seek food’ by Jamison & Brereton suggests, *cid* may be used to indicate that there is an exact match between the time Agni seeks food and the time that someone brings him food. This would be compatible with the function of emphatic assertion of identity that I will assign to *cid* in Section 4.8.¹⁷⁹ For ex. (282) in Section 4.8, I will suggest that *cid* has a specificatory function, which is also possible in the example discussed here. In this case, *ānniyate cid* might be translated as ‘as

¹⁷⁷ ‘Wer dir wie einem Hungrigen Speise bringen wird, (deine Eßlust) reizt, den erfreulichen Gast aufmuntert’.

¹⁷⁸ ‘Celui qui t’apporte de la nourriture (comme on fait à un homme) avide-de-nourriture, (celui qui) aiguise (ta flamme, qui) suscite (en toi) l’hôte réjouissant’.

¹⁷⁹ Witzel et al. (2013: 117) render *cid* as an exclusive particle: ‘Wer für dich Essen bringen wird, wenn du nur Essen suchst’. I do not follow this interpretation.

soon as you seek food’. At any rate, it does not seem to be necessary to assign *cid* a quantifying function in ex. (165).

Among the text passages that Grassmann (1873: 455; 1761) gives are also ex. (57), where I argue that *cid* functions as a beneath-operator, ex. (83), where I consider *cid* to mark emphatic coordination, ex. (181), where I argue for a function as a degree modifier and ex. (272), where *cid* appears to be a restrictive particle. In ex. (162), I have actually argued for a totalizing function.

A further group of problematic cases, only one of which is given by Grassmann (1873: 454f.), are those in which *cid* follows the adverb *purā́* ‘before’ (6 times). The assumption that *cid* is a quantifier in this context appears to be supported by a typological parallel. According to Konnerth (2012: 213f.), in the Tibeto-Burman language Karbi the adverb *hakó* ‘then’ and the additive enclitic *=tā́*, or the reduplicated *hakó~kò=tā́* have the meaning ‘long ago’.¹⁸⁰ However, Konnerth surmises that *=tā́*, as in other contexts, functions as a universal quantifier and that the expression actually means ‘in all of the old days’. Such a function of *cid* would be in accordance with the meaning ‘always, at every time’, which Cappeller (1891: 173) assigns it, although he does not give contexts for this. Importantly, Konnerth also finds a totalizing function of *=tā́* in other contexts that I have identified for *cid*, but she interprets it as universal quantification, which I reject. I will therefore investigate whether a totalizing interpretation of *cid* is possible after *purā́* and which semantic interpretation of *cid* these cases suggest. The one passage that Grassmann (1873: 454f.) gives for generalizing *cid* after *purā́* is the following:

(166) <i>yáthā</i>	<i>jaghántha</i>	<i>dhr̥ṣatā́</i>		<i>purā́</i>	<i>cid</i>	/
like	hit:PERF.2SG	be.bold:PTCP.PRS.ACT.INS.SG.N		earlier	PRT	
<i>evā́</i>	<i>jahi</i>	<i>śátrum</i>	<i>asmákam</i>	<i>indra</i>		
so	hit:IMP.2SG	enemy:ACC.SG.M	1PL.GEN	Indra:VOC.SG.M		

‘Just as you **also** smote boldly before, so smite *our* rival, o Indra.’ RV 2.30.4cd

Here, *pāda c* describes a habitual action performed by Indra in the past. As a result, a quantifying interpretation of *cid* seems plausible. *Cid* would then be comparable to *always* in a sentence like *Back in the day you would always smite your enemies*. This means that *cid* would not quantify over the past time in general (from the beginning of time/from your birth until X) but over the time points within the loosely defined past time span that the speaker refers to by *purā́*. Yet, as the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 445) shows, it is relatively unproblematic to assign *cid* an additive function in this example. The time span denoted by *purā́* is added to the implicit time point ‘now’. The only unusual fact is that *cid* occurs with the first alternative

¹⁸⁰ Konnerth (2012) glosses *hakó* as ‘then’ in her example (1).

and not with the second one, which is implicit here. However, the felicitous English translation shows that this is not impossible. There are, however, cases in which such an additive interpretation is not possible, like the following one:

(167) <i>kúva</i>	<i>tyáni</i>	<i>nau</i>	<i>sakhiyá</i>	<i>babhūvuh</i>	/
where	DEM:NOM.PL.N	1DU.GEN	friendship:NOM.PL.N	be:PERF.3PL	
<i>sácāvahe</i>	<i>yád</i>	<i>avṛkám</i>	<i>purá</i>	<i>cid</i>	
follow:MID.1DU	when	inoffensive:ACC.SG.N	earlier	PRT	

‘Where have these companionships of ours come to be, when previously we would have accompanied one another without wolfish hostility?’ RV 7.88.5ab

This is one of the passages in which Geldner (1907–1909: I, 63) considers *cid* to be a comparative particle. However, he (1907–1909: II, 115) himself concedes that an interpretation of *cid* as a comparative particle is not compelling and considers ‘schon früher’ as a possible translation of *purá cid*. In his translation, he (1951–1957: II, 260) leaves *cid* untranslated.¹⁸¹ In contrast to the previous example, an additive interpretation of *cid* does not seem plausible here. The question in pāda a suggests that the speaker and the addressee are not companions anymore, so that ‘previously’ cannot be added to the implicit ‘now’ as a further time when they accompany one another.¹⁸² Instead, pāda b describes a habitual action in the past so that this appears to be the common property of exx. (166) and (167).¹⁸³ Nevertheless this does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that *cid* is an actual quantifier in this context. An important factor is the form of the main predicate in the clauses that contain *purá cid*. In one half of the six attestations of this collocation, the predicate is in the perfect and in the other half it is in the present. As for the first half, Mumm (2004: 56) states that *purá* with the perfect encodes a habitual action or experience in the past, even without the presence of *cid*. He gives the following example:

(168) <i>tám</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>stuṣa</i>	<i>índaram</i>	<i>tám</i>
DEM:ACC.SG.M	PRT	praise:MID.1SG	Indra:ACC.SG.M	DEM:ACC.SG.M
<i>grñīṣe</i>	/	<i>yásmín</i>	<i>purá</i>	<i>vāvrđhúh</i>
SING:MID.1SG		REL:LOC.SG.M	earlier	grow.strong:PERF.3PL
<i>śāsádús</i>	<i>ca</i>			
exult:PERF.3PL	and			

¹⁸¹ On the presumption that *purá cid* might belong to the clause in the second hemistich of this stanza see Pischel (1897: 56; 91).

¹⁸² Nonetheless, Velankar (1963b: 194) translates it as a scalar additive particle: ‘Where are those friendships of ours (now), which we enjoyed even in the past so lovingly?’. Admittedly, an additive interpretation cannot be fully excluded because the stanza might be understood as ‘Where are our companionships now, which we enjoyed in the (remote) past as well as in recent times?’.

¹⁸³ In his glossary Lanman (1912: 156) renders *cid* in this passage as ‘at least’, but this interpretation does not seem to be applicable to ex. (166).

‘I shall praise him—Indra—I shall sing to him, alongside whom long ago they grew strong and exulted.’ RV 2.20.4ab

This suggests that in ex. (166) it is not *cid* which expresses the habituality of the event. Neither is it in RV 6.22.4 and 8.66.5, where *purā cid* also occurs with a perfect predicate. This is in accordance with Mumm (2004: 56), who regards *cid* in ex. (166) only as an additional means to express the habituality: “Die Usualität kann **zusätzlich** durch *cid* ausgedrückt sein” (my emphasis). As a result, the cases that are like ex. (166) are comparable to the cases of totalizing *cid* after quantifiers, where the quantification, is not expressed by *cid*. A little more complicated is the situation when *purā cid* expresses habituality but occurs with a predicate in the present, for instance in in ex. (167). Mumm (2004: 57) observes that in these passages *purā* occurs either with *cid* or with the particle *sma*. There is one example in which both are present:

(169) <i>ní</i>	<i>śma</i>	<i>māvate</i>	<i>vahathā</i>	<i>purā</i>	<i>cid</i>
LP	PRT	like.me:DAT.SG.M	pull:2PL	earlier	PRT

‘**Even** before you used to carry (it) down to one such as me.’ RV 6.65.4d

As the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 864) that I give in the example shows, it is unproblematic to assign *cid* another function than quantification due to the presence of *sma*, which is not present in ex. (167). Nevertheless, I assume that also in ex. (167), as well as in RV 7.56.23, *cid* is not a quantifier and that the present with *purā* alone can also express habituality, like the perfect. In order to substantiate this claim, it is necessary to regard what Mumm means when he says that *purā* + present always occurs with *cid*, if not with *sma*. In this group he also includes cases in which *cid* does not occur immediately after *purā*, as in the examples under discussion, but somewhere else in the clause, with a different function. For instance, he (2004: 57f.) gives the following example, where *cid* forms an indefinite pronoun with the preceding interrogative (cf. Section 4.3.1):

(170) <i>ahám</i>	<i>só</i>	<i>asmi</i>	<i>yáh</i>	<i>purā</i>	/
1SG.NOM	DEM:NOM.SG.M	be:1SG	REL:NOM.SG.M	earlier	
<i>suté</i>	<i>vádāmi</i>	<i>kāni</i>	<i>cid</i>		
press:PPP.LOC.SG.M	speak:1SG	what:ACC.PL.N	PRT		

‘I am one who used (always) to speak **some** (speeches) at the pressing.’ RV 1.105.7ab

A further example that he (2004: 58) gives is one which I have already discussed in Section 4.2 because *cid* occurs after the conjunction *utá*, together with *u*:

(171) <i>yá</i>	<i>ādhṛāya</i>	[...] / [...] / <i>sthírám</i>	<i>mánaḥ</i>	
REL:NOM.SG.M	poor:DAT.SG.M	solid:ACC.SG.N	mind:ACC.SG.N	
<i>kṛṇuté</i>	<i>sévate</i>	<i>purā</i> /	<i>utó [= utá u]</i>	<i>cid</i>
do:MID.3SG	enjoy:MID.3SG	earlier	and+PRT	PRT
<i>sá</i>	<i>marḍitāram</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>vindate</i>	
DEM:NOM.SG.M	pitier:ACC.SG.M	NEG	find:MID.3SG	

‘Whoever [...] hardens his heart [against a poor man], though he always used to be his friend, he also finds no one to show mercy.’ RV 10.117.2

It is certainly correct that in this example *cid* occurs near the adverb *purā́*, but *cid* actually occurs in a different clause. Hence, one can hardly say that it is *cid* which marks the state encoded by the predicate *sévate* ‘enjoy’, which is in the present and occurs in the same clause as *purā́*, as ongoing. As a result, as is the case with perfect predicates, I do not believe that *cid* is to be regarded as a quantifier but that the combination of *purā́* and the present tense alone suffices to mark a state or event as habitual or ongoing. Again, this is in accordance with Mumm (2004). In spite of his observation that *cid* occurs near habitual events in the past that are encoded by *purā́* and the present tense, he (2004: 60) assumes that *cid* merely enhances the effect of encoding a habit: “Das stets generelle (darin evtl. durch *cid* verdeutlichte) Präs. dient zur Bezeichnung dieses Usus, der (*purā́*) in der Vergangenheit wurzelt und als eigentlich richtig und gültig für die Gegenwart und die (nahe) Zukunft angesehen wird”. Mumm (2004: 56f.; 60f.) sees the following difference between *purā́* with the perfect and *purā́* with the present: With the perfect, it encodes a habitual event that might not hold in the present but potentially could and therefore is expectable; with the present, it also encodes a habitual event in the past, but one that forms a contrast to the inconvenient state of affairs in the present. From these findings, I conclude that *cid* should not be regarded as a quantifier in the six cases where it follows the adverb *purā́*. Instead, these cases should be regarded like ex. (156), where the totalizing function of *cid* is used to emphasize the universal quantification but the particle itself does not quantify over a set of entities. I therefore refrain from labelling *cid* a generalizing particle, contrary to Mumm’s (2004: 57), with whose analysis I agree otherwise. Since in all examples *purā́ cid* occurs with a habitual or ongoing event or state in the past, I assume that in each of these cases *cid* is used to emphasize the habituality/continuity of the event or state, pace Jamison & Brereton (2014), who assign it an additive function in several of these cases.

This concludes my discussion of passages where *cid* is allegedly used as a quantifier. I have not identified any examples in the Rigveda where *cid* necessarily has to be assigned such a function. I therefore conclude that *cid* alone should not be analyzed as a universal or free-choice quantifier (generalizing *cid*). It has this function only in combination with interrogative pronouns or with relative pronouns and conjunctions (see Sections 4.3 and 4.6). The Rigvedic data are therefore in accordance with the typological observations of both Ying (2017) and König (2017), namely that additives typically are themselves not employed as indefinites or universal quantifiers. The same appears to be true for the Old Persian cognate particle =*ci* (Coenen 2020–2021 [2022]: 32–35).

4.5 *cid* as a degree modifier

In the previous section, I have shown that *cid* occasionally has a special function when it occurs after quantifiers like *vísva-* ‘all’ and the numeral *catúr-* ‘four’. However, there are other conspicuous cases where *cid* occurs after vague quantifiers and apparently does not have additive function. A particular case in point is the quantifying nominal *purú-* ‘much, many’. For Proto-Indo-European, Dunkel (2014: 451) reconstructs the collocation **p̥lh₁ú-h₂ k^uid* (> *purú cid*), which he assigns the meaning ‘very much’ (‘gar viel’). He follows Schwyzer (1939: 299), who assumes an adverbial meaning for the collocation Vedic *purú cid*, and compares this with Greek *πολλάκι* ‘much, often’, which Dunkel describes as a pluralization of “*πολό κι*” (see also Wackernagel 1881: 286f. on this matter).¹⁸⁴ Schwyzer translates *purú cid* ‘many times’ (‘vielmals’) and Dunkel as ‘often’ (‘oftmals’). As Dunkel (2014: 451) states, *purú cid* occurs 5 times in the Rigveda. However, I am not convinced that it should be interpreted as a multiplicative adverb as Schwyzer suggests. Consider the following text passage:

(172) *utá smā sadyá ít pári / śaśamānāya*
 and PRT in.one.day PRT LP labor:PTCP.PRS.MID.DAT.SG.M
sunvaté / purú cin maṃhase
 press:PTCP.PRS.ACT.DAT.SG.M many:ACC.PL.N PRT bestow:MID.2SG
vásu
 good:ACC.PL.N

‘And (you) always (circle) around (the peoples? realms?) in a single day; on the laboring presser you bounteously bestow many goods.’ RV 4.31.8

Following the interpretation of *purú cid* by Dunkel (2014: 451), one might translate pādas b/c as ‘on the laboring presser you often bestow goods’, but as the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 606) in the example shows, this is not the only option. It is entirely unproblematic to interpret *purú* as a NOM/ACC.PL.N and with *vásu* ‘goods’ there is another such form within the clause. Hence, *purú* can be interpreted as the attribute of *vásu*. Thus, from a purely synchronic point of view I see no reason to assign a special meaning to *purú cid* and this view is also reflected in the translations of this passage. The question is then how *cid* is to be interpreted. Geldner (1951–1957: I, 460) and Witzel et al. (2013: 169) translate *cid* as ‘even’ (‘sogar’).¹⁸⁵ This is not impossible but at least it seems somewhat unintuitive. Since it is the attribute *purú* ‘much’ that precedes *cid* and not the head *vásu* ‘good’, I assume that there is narrow focus on the attribute. This means that ‘many’ should be added to another, lower

¹⁸⁴ Arnold (1905: 114) treats *purú cid* in a paragraph on adverbs.

¹⁸⁵ ‘Auch schenkst du alsbald dem, der den Opferdienst versieht und (Soma) auspreßt, sogar viel Gut’ (Geldner); ‘Und du schenkst allezeit sofort ringsum demjenigen, der sich abgemüht hat (und den Soma) auspreßt, die Güter, sogar viele’ (Witzel et al.).

amount, for instance, ‘not only do you bestow some goods, you bestow even many goods’. However, the context of ex. (172) does not suggest that the poet specifically has different possible amounts of good in mind, he merely wants to convey that the laboring presser receives abundantly. Hence, I assume that the function of *cid* is comparable to that of degree modifiers like *very*, which according to Traugott (2006: 338) can, among other descriptors, be called BOOSTERS or AMPLIFIERS. Kennedy & McNally (2005: 369) explain that “[r]oughly speaking, the difference between, for example, *expensive* and *very expensive* is that the latter denotes a property whose meaning is just like the former’s, except that the relative standard is raised by some amount”. Accordingly, the nominal expression *purú cid vásu* may be translated as ‘very many goods’ or ‘so many goods’. Consider now the following example, in which *purú* has been considered an adverb but with a different meaning than that assigned by Dunkel (2014: 451):

(173) <i>sá</i>		<i>hí</i>	<i>purú</i>		<i>cid</i>	<i>ójasā</i>
DEM:NOM.SG.M		for	many:ACC.PL.N		PRT	might:INS.SG.N
<i>virúkmata</i>	/	<i>dīdyāno</i>				<i>bhāvati</i>
shining:INS.SG.N		shine:PTCP.PERF.MID.NOM.SG.M				become:3SG
<i>druhamtarāḥ</i>			/ [...] /	<i>vīlú</i>		<i>cid</i>
overcoming.deceit:NOM.SG.M				firm:ACC.SG.N		PRT
						<i>yāsya</i>
						REL:GEN.SG.M
<i>sámṛtau</i>	/	<i>śrīvad</i>	<i>vāneva</i>			<i>yāt</i>
fight:LOC.SG.M		melt:INJ.3SG	tree:NOM.PL.N+like			REL:NOM.SG.N
<i>sthirām</i>						
solid:NOM.SG.N						

‘He **indeed**, shining mightily with his shining strength, becomes the conqueror of deceitful foes. [...] He at whose onslaught **even** what is strong melts away, steady things (waste away) like forests (which are burnt or bend down in the storm)’ (Oldenberg 1897: 129)

‘Because he, shining upon the many with his radiant might, becomes the overcomer of deceit ...’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 293) RV 1.127.3a–e

In the interpretation by Oldenberg (1897: 129), which is shared by Geldner (1951–1957: I, 176),¹⁸⁶ *purú* is a NOM/ACC.SG.N which functions as a modal adverb modifying the participle *dīdyānas* ‘shining’. Hence, contrary to the reconstruction by Dunkel (2014: 451), the long final *-ú* of *purú* is in this interpretation not inherited but a variant of the short singular form *purú* (see Arnold 1905: 114). Following Dunkel (2014: 451), one would have to translate pāda a as ‘Because he, shining often with his radiant might’. Such adverbial interpretations are not the only possible options. Witzel & Gotō (2007: 234) possibly consider *purú* to agree with *ójasā* ‘with might’.¹⁸⁷ Jamison (comm.I.2: ad loc.) explains that neither this nor the adverbial

¹⁸⁶ ‘Denn er, der gar sehr mit strahlender Kraft leuchtet, ist der Unholdüberwinder’.

¹⁸⁷ ‘Denn er wird, indem er mit ohnehin viel aufleuchtender Körperkraft leuchtet, zu einem den Trug Überwindenden’; Jamison (comm.I.2: ad loc.) surmises that Witzel & Gotō regard *purú* as an instrumental, but it

interpretations capture what is expressed by the sequence of four instances of *cid*, two of which occur in the following stanza: “Each instance of *cid* ‘even’ in this sequence emphasizes the formidable targets Agni is exercising his will upon”. As a result, she regards *purú* as a plural and as the object of *dīdyānaḥ*, just like the other three forms preceding *cid* are objects.¹⁸⁸ Nevertheless she concedes that “[u]nfortunately this value of *cid* is not so much in evidence in our phrase *purú cid ... dīdyānaḥ* because ‘shining’ (at least as expressed with the root $\sqrt{dī}$) is not ordinarily a forceful or hostile act”. According to my interpretation of *cid*, the difference in the nature of the events would be paralleled by different functions of *cid*. For I regard *cid* in pāda 3a as a degree modifier whereas the others are scalar additive particles. Yet, as the number of things that Agni shines upon is marked as remarkably high, this is still a “formidable” deed of Agni, which can be aligned with the other deeds involving *cid* in spite of their different nature. Thinking of formidable deeds rather than “formidable targets” might solve the difficulty in translating *cid* in pāda 3a that Jamison (comm.I.2: ad loc.) expresses. I am, however, uncertain whether this means that an interpretation of *purú* as denoting the things upon which Agni shines is to be preferred over one as an adverb modifying the participle. An analysis of *cid* after *purú* as a degree modifier is also applicable to RV 3.58.5 and 5.74.8. In the difficult passage RV 10.10.1, it is possible to interpret *cid* as a degree modifier but other interpretations are possible as well (see e.g. Geldner 1907–1909: II, 145, Oldenberg 1909–1912: II, 204, Schnaus 2008: 163f., Bodewitz 2009: 257, Jamison comm.X.1: ad loc.).

The degree modifying function of *cid* does not only occur after the form *purú* but also after other inflectional forms. Consider ex. (231) in Section 4.6.2.2, where I argue for such a function of *cid* after the NOM.PL.F *pūrvīs*. Another such case is RV 10.111.4, where *cid* occurs after the ACC.PL.N *purūṇi*. As there appears to be no difference between *purú cid* and *cid* after other inflectional forms of *purú-*, I regard them as equal and do not assign a special meaning to *purú cid*. In addition to different forms of the inflectional paradigm, degree modifying *cid* occurs with derived forms of *purú-*, as the following example shows:

(174) <i>kúveyatha</i>		<i>kuvéd</i>		<i>asi</i>		/
where+go:PERF.2SG		where+PRT		be:2SG		
<i>purutrā</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>te</i>		<i>mánaḥ</i>	
in.many.places	PRT	for	2SG.GEN		mind:NOM.SG.N	

might also be that ‘viel’ is meant to be an adverb, which would then be comparable to the interpretation by Dunkel (2014: 451).

¹⁸⁸ Similarly Grassmann (1876–1877: II, 129), who regards *purú* as a singular: ‘Denn er, der viel mit seiner flammenreichen Kraft bestrahlt, er ist es, welcher die Dämonen tilgt’. Cp. also Renou (1955–1969: XII, 28): ‘Oui, ce (dieu) qui brille en maint endroit avec sa resplendissante force-redoutable, il traverse le mal comme la hache abattant le bois mieux (qu’aucune autre)’.

‘Where have you gone? Where are you? For **surely** your mind is in many places.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1022)

‘... For your mind is in **very** many places.’ (my adaptation) RV 8.1.7ab

As in ex. (172), an additive interpretation of *cid* seems odd. Moreover, I consider the function as a degree modifier more plausible than Jamison & Brereton’s (2014: 1022) ‘surely’. In Section 4.6.2.2, I will argue that *cid* also expresses this function after *purutrā* in ex. (230). It is also possible to assume this function in the next example, where *cid* occurs after *purūrūṇā* ‘far and wide’:

(175) <i>purūrūṇā</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>ásti</i>	/	<i>ávo</i>	<i>nūnám</i>
far.and.wide	PRT	for	be:3SG		help:NOM.SG.N	now
<i>vām</i>	<i>varuṇa</i>		/	<i>mítṛa</i>		
2DU.GEN	Varuṇa:VOC.SG.M			Mítṛa:VOC.SG.M		

‘**EVEN** far and wide, O Varuṇa and Mitra, doth your grace extend.’ (Griffith 1896–1897: I, 539)

‘Your grace is extended **very** far and wide, o Varuṇa and Mitra’ (my adaptation)¹⁸⁹ RV 5.70.1

I surmise that *cid* also functions as a degree modifier in the following example, where it occurs after the compound *puru-médas*- ‘having much wisdom’:

(176) <i>bradhnás</i>		<i>cid</i>	<i>átra</i>	<i>váto</i>	<i>ná</i>
copper.colored:NOM.SG.M		PRT	there	wind:NOM.SG.M	like
<i>jūtáḥ</i>	/	<i>purumédhas</i>		<i>cit</i>	
drive:PPP.NOM.SG.M		with.much.wisdom:NOM.SG.M		PRT	
<i>tákave</i>	<i>náram</i>		<i>dāt</i>		
rushing:DAT.SG.M	man:ACC.SG.M		give:AOR.INJ.3SG		

‘The copper-colored (Sun/Fire), sped like the wind, is **also** there. The very wise one [=Soma?] **also** gives (to us) the superior man [=Indra?] to make the charge.’ RV 9.97.52cd

The first *cid* in pāda c is an additive particle, which suggests that the second *cid*, which occupies the parallel position in pāda d, has a parallel function. This is reflected in the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1343), but they assume that the focus follows *cid*, which I attempt to avoid and which also makes the structure of the two pādas less parallel.¹⁹⁰ I therefore suggest interpreting *cid* as a degree modifier marking a high degree of *purú*- within the compound, so that *purumédhas cid* can be understood as ‘the one who possesses very much wisdom’.

The quantifier *purú*- is not the only one with which *cid* can appear (cf. Wackernagel 1881: 286f.). Consider the following example with *bhūri*- ‘much, many’:

¹⁸⁹ Cf. the translation by Witzel et al. (2013: 320): ‘Gar vollumfänglich ist ja nun eure Hilfe, Varuṇa’.

¹⁹⁰ On a different interpretation of the pāda with *purumédhas* as the focus of *cid* see Ludwig (1876–1888: II, 507): ‘hier ist auch der braune wie der wind schnell, auch Purumedha, der an närendem safte reiche soll zu raschem laufe den helden geben’. Cf. also Ludwig (1876–1888: V, 375).

(177) *bhūri* *cid* *aryáḥ* *sudāstarāya*
much:NOM.SG.N PRT stranger:ABL.SG.M generous:COMP.DAT.SG.M

‘There is much for him who gives **even** more than the stranger.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 389)

‘There is **very** much for him who gives more than the stranger.’ (my adaptation) RV 1.185.9c

Witzel & Gotō (2007: 336) interpret *cid* as a scalar additive particle and translate ‘even much’.¹⁹¹ As in ex. (172), I find this interpretation odd. As can be seen in the translation of ex. (177), Jamison & Brereton (2014: 389) try to maintain the additive function of *cid* by assuming that its focus is the following nominal *aryás* ‘than the stranger’ (see also Ludwig 1876–1888: I, 182 and an alternative attempt in IV, 173).¹⁹² Contrary to these interpretations, I follow Geldner (1951–1957: I, 266),¹⁹³ who renders *cid* as the degree modifying ‘gar’ (but see also Geldner 1901: 75). Other passages in which *cid* following *bhūri* may function as a degree modifier are RV 3.39.8 and 7.4.2. In one passage, *cid* occurs after *bahú-* ‘much’, where such an interpretation is possible as well:

(178) *ádha* *bahú* *cit* *táma* *úrmiyāyās* / *tiráḥ*
then much:ACC.SG.N PRT darkness:ACC.SG.N night:GEN.SG.F LP

śociṣā *dadr̥ṣe* *pavākāḥ*
flame:INS.SG.N see:PERF.MID.3SG pure:NOM.SG.M

‘so **even** across the dense darkness of the night the pure one is visible with his flame.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 785)

‘so across the **very** dense darkness ...’ (my adaptation) RV 6.10.4cd

In his glossary, which does not comprise the entire Rigveda, Geldner (1907–1909: I, 62f.) gives one passage with *cid* meaning ‘gar’. As the previous example has shown, ‘gar’ is used as a degree modifier in German (cf. Paul 2002: 368f.). In the passage that Geldner gives, *cid* follows the temporal adverb *jyók* ‘long’, which quantifies over time points:

(179) *jyók* *cid* *átra* *tasthivāṃso* *akrañ*
long PRT here stand:PTCP.PERF.ACT.NOM.PL.M do:AOR.3.PL

‘They have made a long delay, **just** staying here.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 138)

‘They have made a **very** long delay, staying here.’ (my adaptation) RV 1.33.15c

In this passage, it appears unintuitive to interpret *cid* as an additive particle, which is also reflected in the translations.¹⁹⁴ Renou (1955–1969: XVII, 14) translates it as ‘certainly’ (‘certes’) whereas Geldner (1951–1957: I, 40f.) renders it as ‘already’ (‘schon’), contrary to

¹⁹¹ ‘Sogar vieles (ist da) für den, der freigebiger ist als ein (anderer) Sippenherr’.

¹⁹² Renou (1955–1969: XV, 119) construes *cid* with *aryás* as well: ‘(Il y a) beaucoup (de biens à prévoir) pour un (patron) plus généreux que l’ Étranger même’.

¹⁹³ ‘Gar viel (gebt) dem, der freigebiger als ein (anderer) hoher Herr ist!’.

¹⁹⁴ But see Velankar (1948: 12): ‘The enemies who stood here, lingered even for a long time’.

what he (1907–1909: I, 63) gives in his glossary.¹⁹⁵ Other translations, like Griffith (1896–1897: I, 47), do not render *cid* at all: ‘Long stood they there before the task was ended’. As can be seen in the example, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 138) translate *cid* as ‘just’. Even though this ‘just’ is compatible with its exclusive function (cf. Section 4.8), they construe it with *tasthivāṃso* ‘standing’, which appears later in the clause, rather than with the preceding word. As can also be seen in the example, I propose an analysis that builds on the meaning of *cid* that Geldner (1907–1909: I, 63) gives for this text passage, viz. the meaning as a degree modifier, which is in accordance with the usual syntax of *cid*. I propose the same analysis for the next example, where *cid* also follows *jyók*:

(180) <i>vétīd</i> [= <i>véti id</i>]	<i>divó</i>	<i>janúṣā</i>	<i>kác</i>
pursue:3SG+PRT	heaven:ABL.SG.M	birth:INS.SG.N	what:ACC.SG.N
<i>cid</i>	<i>ā</i>	<i>śúcir</i>	/
PRT	LP	shiny:NOM.SG.M	<i>jyók</i>
			for.long
			<i>cid</i>
			PRT
			<i>atti</i>
			eat:3SG
<i>gárbho</i>	<i>yád</i>	<i>ácyutam</i>	
child:NOM.SG.M	REL:NOM.SG.N	immovable:NOM.SG.N	

‘He, ablaze right from his birth, pursues any (food) whatever from heaven here. For a long time the embryo eats **just** what is immovable.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 789)

‘... For a **very** long time the embryo eats what is immovable.’ (my adaptation) RV 6.15.1cd

In ex. (180), Geldner (1951–1957: II, 106f.) and Renou (1955–1969: XIII, 46) interpret *cid* as a scalar additive particle the focus of which is *ácyutam* ‘immovable’ in the relative clause.¹⁹⁶ Jamison & Brereton (2014: 789) assume the same focus but a different function of *cid*. They translate ‘For a long time the embryo eats just what is immovable’, interpreting it as a restrictive particle (cf. Section 4.8). From a semantic point of view this may be plausible, but syntactically I would again expect the focus of *cid* to precede rather than follow it. As a result, I suggest that *cid* should be interpreted as associated with the preceding word, i.e. *jyók* ‘long’. This interpretation even allows for an interpretation of *cid* as a scalar additive particle: ‘Even for a long time the embryo eats what is immovable’ (see the comment by Velankar 1955: 57). For according to Jamison (comm. VI.1: ad loc.), this pāda contrasts with the preceding one (ex. (110) in Section 4.3.1): “although the flames of the ritual fire actively reach for heaven in pāda c, the fire itself, just kindled, starts by burning the kindling sticks, which are immovable as opposed to the oblation later poured into the fire”. If the whole event in pāda d is unexpected, it is all the

¹⁹⁵ ‘Longtemps certes ils étaient restés là immobiles’ (Renou); ‘Schon lange hatten sie hier verweilend gesäumt’ (Geldner).

¹⁹⁶ ‘Seit langer Zeit verzehrt der Neugeborene selbst das, was fest ist’ (Geldner); ‘depuis longtemps il mange (tout aliment, fût-il) même inébranlable, (et cela dès qu’il est) nouveau-né’ (Renou).

more unexpected, that this event lasts ‘for a long time’, so that a scalar additive function is explicable.

In addition to vague quantifiers, I assume that *cid* also occurs after nominals which in the terminology of Dixon (1999: 1) can be classified as DESCRIPTIVE ADJECTIVES. However, in many cases it is difficult to distinguish the degree modifying function of *cid* from its scalar additive functions. Nevertheless, I will continue to give a non-exhaustive list of cases where I assume *cid* to have this function in order to demonstrate that it is not restricted to vague quantifiers. Consider the following text passage:

(181) *dāti* *priyāṇi* *cid* *vāsu*
 give:AOR.SBJV.3SG dear:ACC.PL.N PRT good:ACC.PL.N

‘He will give **especially** dear goods.’ RV 4.8.3c

Griffith (1896–1897: I, 405) translates ‘He gives e’en treasures that we love’. However, one may assume here that there is narrow focus on the attribute *priyāṇi* ‘dear’.¹⁹⁷ This would mean that ‘dear’ marks a high point on a scale of characteristics that ‘goods’ may have, e.g. *inconvenient* > *mediocre* > *dear*. As it would be contradictory to assume that there are inconvenient goods, I reject this analysis. Rather, I assume that *cid* is used to indicate that the goods are dear to a high degree. This is in accordance with Geldner (1951–1957: I, 429), who translates *cid* as ‘gar’.¹⁹⁸ This idea is also captured by Jamison & Brereton’s (2014: 571) ‘especially’, given in the example, for English *especially* also functions as a degree modifier, in addition to being a particularizer (König 1991: 97).¹⁹⁹ I regard the two following passages as examples of *cid* as a degree modifier too:

(182) *vātasya* *yuktān* *suyūjaś* *cid*
 Wind:GEN.SG.M yoke:PPP:ACC.PL.M well.yoked:ACC.PL.M PRT
āsvān / *kaviś* *cid* *eṣó*
 horse:ACC.PL.M sage:NOM.SG.M PRT DEM:NOM.SG.M
ajagann *avasyúḥ*
 go:PLUPRF.3SG seeking.help:NOM.SG.M

‘It was just this sage poet [=Indra?] who had gone, seeking help, to the yoked horses of the Wind, **so** easy to yoke.’ RV 5.31.10ab

(183) *tigmám* *cid* *éma* *máhi*
 sharp:NOM.SG.N PRT course:NOM.SG.N great:NOM.SG.N
várpo *asya*
 form:NOM.SG.N DEM:GEN.SG.M

‘Sharp is his course, great his form.’ RV 6.3.4.a

¹⁹⁷ Cp. also Renou (1955–1969: XIII, 13): ‘il donne des biens, voire (des biens) aimés’.

¹⁹⁸ ‘er gibt uns gar liebe Güter’.

¹⁹⁹ I reject the interpretation by Witzel et al. (2013: 131), who assign *cid* the meaning of a free-choice quantifier: ‘Er soll (uns) liebe, welche auch immer, Güter geben’. On the alleged quantifying function of *cid* see Section 4.4.

In ex. (182), Geldner (1897: 164) translates *cid* as ‘gar’, which reflects my analysis as does Jamison & Brereton’s (2014: 695) ‘so’. Later, Geldner (1951–1957: II, 30) revises his analysis and renders *cid* as the comparative particle ‘wie’, which I do not consider a possible function (see Section 4.9).²⁰⁰ In ex. (183), the degree modifying use of *cid* can be observed after a nominal predicate, so that I suggest adapting the translation to ‘very sharp is his course, ...’.

The following example is a difficult case, where the function of *cid* that I have illustrated by the previous examples has been assumed but where another interpretation may have to be adduced:

(184) <i>tám</i>	<i>śagmāso</i>	<i>aruśāso</i>	<i>ásvā</i>	/
DEM:ACC.SG.M	capable:NOM.PL.M	ruddy:NOM.PL.M	horse:NOM.PL.M	
<i>br̥haspátim</i>	<i>sahavāho</i>	<i>vahanti</i>	/	<i>sáhas</i>
Br̥haspati:ACC.SG.M	pulling.together:NOM.PL.M	pull:3PL		strength:ACC.SG.N
<i>cid</i>	<i>yásya</i>	<i>nīlavat</i>	<i>sadhástham</i>	
PRT	REL:GEN.SG.M	dark:NOM.SG.N	seat:NOM.SG.N	

‘Capable, ruddy horses who pull together are pulling Br̥haspati, the **very** powerful one, whose seat is dark’.²⁰¹

‘The capable, ruddy horses who pull together are pulling Br̥haspati, who is simply strength itself, whose seat has darkness’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1006) RV 7.97.6a–c

A vital question for the interpretation of *cid* is whether *sáhas* is to be interpreted as property-denoting ‘powerful’ or entity-denoting ‘strength’. Geldner (1951–1957: II, 267) opts for the first alternative. In this interpretation, *cid* marks a high degree of ‘powerful’. However, Renou (1955–1969: XV, 68) remarks that he would expect **sahás* as the adjectival form and that he finds no compelling passages for an adjectival *sáhas*. Hence, he translates it as entity-denoting.²⁰² Schmidt (1968: 64) agrees with him but does not follow his translation entirely.²⁰³ Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1006) also translate it as entity denoting, as the translation of the example shows. Jamison (comm.VII: ad loc.) assumes “that Br̥haspati is identified as strength itself” (cf. Dōyama & Gotō 2022: 623). I believe that this interpretation is compatible with the scalar additive function of *cid* so that I suggest changing their (2014: 1006) translation ‘Br̥haspati, who is simply strength itself’ to ‘Br̥haspati, who is even strength (itself)’.

²⁰⁰ ‘Zu dem Gespann des Vāta, den gar leicht sich schirrenden Rossen war er, der Seher, hilfbereit gekommen’ (Geldner 1897: 164); ‘(Lenke) die Gespanne des Vāta, wie gutgeschirrte Rosse; sogar dieser Seher ist schutzsuchend gekommen’ (Geldner 1951–1957: II, 30).

²⁰¹ The translation follows Geldner (1951–1957: II, 267): ‘Diesen Br̥haspati fahren tüchtige, rötliche Rosse gemeinsam ziehend, das gar gewaltige Wesen, dessen Sitz dunkelfarbig ist’.

²⁰² ‘Ce Br̥haspati, des chevaux vigoureux, de couleur-fauve, tirant ensemble, le convoient, / lui dont la force-dominante (est réelle, dont) le séjour-commun (est) noir’.

²⁰³ ‘Tüchtige, rötliche Rosse, die gemeinsam fahren, fahren den Br̥haspati, dessen Gewalt eine schwarze Stätte ist’.

By the previous examples in this section I have aimed to show that *cid* need not have scalar additive function when it occurs after quantifiers and property-denoting nominals but that it is in several cases more plausible to interpret it as a degree modifier. From a semantic point of view, it seems plausible that *cid* can have both functions. Following Traugott (2006: 343), focus particles and degree modifiers share the property that “they involve the speaker’s assessment and evaluation of intensity, position on a scale, ordering of alternatives, etc.”. Nonetheless, she (2006: 341) points out that in contrast to degree modifiers, focus particles merely evoke scales but are not scalar themselves. In order to corroborate my analysis, I will now adduce data from other languages in which a scalar additive operator can also function as a degree modifier. Following Bakker (1988: 68–71), in Homeric Greek the scalar additive particle *περ* has an intensifying function when it occurs with adjectives in restrictive relative clauses modified by *τε* or in non-factual statements. In these cases, it gives an adjective in the positive form a superlative meaning. Bakker speaks of “scalar superlatives”. Two of the examples that Bakker (1988: 68; 70) gives are the following:

(185) γῆ	φουσίζοος,	ἦ	τε	κατὰ
earth:NOM.SG.F	fruitful:NOM.SG.F	REL:NOM.SG.F	PRT	down
κρατερόν	περ ἐρύκει			
stout:ACC.SG.M	PRT restrain:3SG			

‘the fruitful Earth (= the Netherworld), **who** holds **the strongest man** down.’ Il. 21.63

(186) ὑπό	κεν	ταλασίφρονά	περ	δέος
under	PRT	stout.hearted:ACC.SG.M	PRT	fear:NOM.SG.N
εἶλεν				
seize:AOR.3SG				

‘**The stoutest heart** might well have been dismayed.’ Il 4.421²⁰⁴

According to the analysis of Bakker, the situation in Greek is different from the one in Vedic, because the intensifying function of *περ* is restricted to certain contexts, whereas such a restriction for the degree modifying function of *cid* does not seem to exist. Another element that exhibits a behavior that is similar to the one I assume for *cid* is the German particle *gar*, which Dunkel (2014: 451) uses to translate **p̥h₁ú-h₂ k^hid* and which Geldner (1951–1957: I, 266) uses to translate *cid* for instance in ex. (177) above. In German, not only the compound form *sogar* but also *gar* alone is used as a scalar additive particle. This can be illustrated by means of the following example from König (1981: 126):

(187) *Um ein Pferd oder **gar/sogar** einen Elefanten zu ernähren, braucht man viel Heu.*

‘To keep a horse or **even** an elephant you need a lot of hay.’

²⁰⁴ Bakker gives the Greek text in Latin script. The boldface type is his; the glosses are mine. In the first example, his Greek text does not contain the word *κατὰ*.

Notice that although in this example *gar* and *sogar* are interchangeable, they are not equally distributed because *gar* is far more restricted. See König (1981) for further details. Albeit rather obsolete, *gar* can also be used with adjectives in order to signal a high degree. Thus, according to Paul (2002: 368f.), *gar* can be equated to *sehr* ‘very’. Accordingly, Geldner’s translation of ex. (177) ‘Gar viel (gebt) dem’ can be translated into English as ‘Very much (give) to him’. A further case that is apparently similar is the particle *tão* from Colloquial Burmese. Following Ozerov (2014: 170f.), *tão* can also be used both as a scalar additive particle and, at least apparently, as a marker of high degree. He gives the following examples:

(188) *ŋo.mé-ŋo.mé* *ho-tɕí* *di-tɕí-pʰjiʔ-ne-té* *ʔú-ko*
 make.a.crying.grimace-RDP that-look this-look-be-CONT-R\REL PN-OBJ
ʔèsãda=tãu *θənà-θwà-pa-tɕ*
 PN=even feel.pity-GO-POL-R
 ‘{**Even Aye Sandar**}*tãu* felt pity for Oo, who was looking here and there with a crying grimace.’

(189) *ba-pʰjiʔ=ló* *di-lauʔ= tãu* *ŋo-ne-já-ta=lè=té*
 what-be=COMPZ this-much=even cry-stay-NVL-R.NMLZ=Q=QUOT
 ‘‘Why are you crying that **much***tãu* ?!’ [he would ask].’

Ozerov (2014: 171f.) explains that the use found in the second example “is especially noticeable with expressions of measure”. According to his analysis, the primary function of *tão* is to express “mirative excessiveness” or “unlikely excessiveness” rather than being an additive particle. This raises the question of whether *cid* could also be analyzed this way. This would mean that *cid* in the previous examples is not actually a degree modifier. In order to pursue this question further, a comparison with the Polish particle *aż* can be helpful. For according to Tomaszewicz (2013: 280), this particle is scalar in that it signals a high position on a contextual scale,²⁰⁵ but like Burmese *tão* it is not additive, as she (2013: 284) shows by means of the following example:

(190) *Janek rozmawiał aż/(#nawet) z rektorem, ale nie rozmawiał*
 Janek talked aż/even with chancellor but not talked
z nikim innym.
 with nobody else

‘Janek talked to somebody **so important as** the chancellor, but he did not talk to anybody else.’

Unlike the scalar additive particle *nawet* ‘even’, *aż* can be used in such a context. It is difficult to tell whether Vedic *cid* can be used in such a way. At least, in the following example, the focus of *cid* appears to be high on a scale while an additive value seems to be absent:

²⁰⁵ She assumes *even* to evoke a likelihood scale.

(191)	<i>abhí</i>	<i>prá</i>	<i>bhara</i>	<i>dhr̥ṣatā́</i>	<i>dhr̥ṣanmanah</i>	/
	LP	LP	bear:IMP.2SG	boldly	with.bold.mind:VOC.SG.M	
	<i>śrávaś</i>		<i>cid</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>asad</i>	<i>bṛhát</i>
	fame:NOM.SG.N		PRT	2SG.DAT	be:SBJV.3SG	lofty:NOM.SG.N

‘[Maruts:] “Bear down boldly, you of bold mind: there will be lofty fame for you.’ RV 8.89.4ab

Geldner (1951–1957: II, 413) appears to interpret *cid* as a degree modifier again, for according to him, one can translate pāda b as ‘very high fame is to be there for you’.²⁰⁶ However, in this passage *cid* follows the head and not the attribute so that I reject his interpretation. Tomaszewicz (2012: 330–332) notices that the use of *až* is reminiscent of that of a degree modifier like *very*. Nevertheless, by means of the following examples she shows that they behave differently:

(192)	<i>Maria</i>	<i>studiuje</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>bardzo</i>	<i>prestizowej</i>	<i>uczelni,</i>
	Maria	studies	at	very	prestigious	college
	<i>až</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>Uniwersytecie</i>	<i>Humboldta.</i>		
	až	at	university	Humboldt		

‘Maria studies at a very prestigious institution, at **no less than** the Humboldt University.’

(193)	<i>Maria</i>	<i>studiuje</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>prestizowej</i>	<i>uczelni,</i>	<i>(?až)</i>	<i>na</i>
	Maria	studies	at	prestigious	college	až	at
	<i>Uniwersytecie</i>	<i>Humboldta.</i>					
	university	Humboldt					

‘Maria studies at a prestigious institution, (?at **no less than**) the Humboldt University.’

Tomaszewicz (2012: 331) explains that “[b]eing a propositional operator, *až* does not apply to gradable properties. *Až* operates on a set of propositions and not a set of degrees”. In this it contrasts with degree modifiers like *very*. Given the fact that according to Tomaszewicz (2012: 331) the proposition on which *až* operates “can be significantly high on the contextual scale of alternatives”, *cid* does not seem to have a comparable function. Consider again ex. (174) above. In pāda a, the poet asks where Indra is and in pāda b he gives the reason why he has asked this question. Since he has asked this question, he already knows that it is typical for Indra not to stay in one place. Hence, his mind being in many places cannot be said to rank specifically high on a scale. Apart from this, there are other reasons why *cid* should not be regarded as a functional equivalent of *až*. As passages like ex. (33) in Section 4.1 show, there are cases where *cid* expresses additivity while the feature of scalarity is absent. Moreover, Tomaszewicz (2012, 2013) characterizes *až* as the counterpart of scalar *only* in that it is exclusive but excludes the lower alternatives. In Section 4.8, I will show examples where I assume *cid* to have the function of scalar *only*. This leaves the question of how to interpret *cid* in ex. (191) above. Possibly it is

²⁰⁶ ‘gar hoher Ruhm soll dir werden!’.

additive, because the Maruts are aware that Indra will also gain another reward, which is not explicitly mentioned. However, I am not certain about this.

Nevertheless, the Rigvedic data show that *cid* behaves differently from Polish *aż* and Burmese *tāo*, as well as from Homeric $\pi\epsilon\rho$. Rather, it can be compared to the somewhat obsolete use of German *gar* in that it functions both as a scalar additive particle and as a degree modifier, although the scalar additive function of *gar* is more restricted than that of *cid*. I have shown that the degree modifying function of *cid* occurs with quantifiers and also with descriptive adjectives, although with the latter, the function is often difficult to distinguish from an additive one. In addition, I have argued against the assumption by Schwyzer (1939: 299) and Dunkel (2014: 451) that *purú cid* has a specialized adverbial meaning.

4.6 *cid* as a marker of concessivity

This section is concerned with the occurrences of *cid* in concessive contexts. Before analyzing the Rigvedic data, I will give a brief introduction to the notion of concessivity and related phenomena. After that, I will investigate the occurrences of *cid* in clauses that have been analyzed as concessive or concessive conditional clauses. In addition, I will investigate cases in which *cid* occurs with secondary predicates, because among the subtype of circumstantial secondary predicates one group involves the semantic relation of concession.

4.6.1 Concessives and related constructions

Following König (1988: 146–149), two clauses that are in a concessive relation exhibit the following main characteristics. Firstly, they are factual, which means that a sentence with the pattern *although p, q* entails both *p* and *q*. Secondly, a sentence with this pattern presupposes that the two clauses are usually not compatible with each other, i.e. the truth of *p* is an unfavorable circumstance for the truth of *q*.

König (1985: 3–7) delimits concessives from conditionals, concessive conditionals (‘irrelevance’ conditionals) and adversatives. Based on König & Eisenberg (1984: 314–317), König (1985: 3–5) adduces semantic criteria to distinguish the first three groups.²⁰⁷ Concessives and conditionals differ with respect to their truth-conditions: As I have just mentioned, for a concessive sentence to be true, both the main clause and the concessive subclause need to be

²⁰⁷ I will not discuss adversatives in the course of my investigation.

true. Hence, they “have a factual character” (König 1988: 146). In contrast, a conditional is true even if the antecedent or both antecedent and consequent are false. Compare the following two sentences:

(194) *Even though Fred is English, he speaks fluent French.* (König 1985: 3)

(195) *If you water them once a week, these plants will grow very big.* (de Swart 1998: 58)

As König (1985: 3) explains, Fred both has to be English and has to speak fluent French in order to make ex. (194) a true sentence. Regarding the truth of ex. (195), de Swart (1998: 59) explains: “We know that plants die if they don’t get water, so in a context in which the antecedent is false, there is no chance of the consequent coming out true. The specific contents of the propositions and causal relations between them do not affect the truth-conditional import of the *if ... then* connective, though”.

A distinctive property of concessive conditionals that König (1985: 3–5) observes is that they “relate a series of antecedent conditions to a consequent”, and not just a single one like the conditional in (195) does. König (1985: 3–5) further elaborates that there are three ways in which the multiplicity of conditions in the antecedent may be expressed, namely by means of disjunction, universal or free-choice quantifiers or by scalar expressions. He gives the following three examples of these three types of conditionals:

(196) a. *Whether he is right or not, we must support him.*

b. *However much advice you give him, he does exactly what he wants to do.*

c. *Even if nobody helps me, I’ll manage.*

Following the terminology of Haspelmath & König (1998), I will call these groups ALTERNATIVE, UNIVERSAL and SCALAR CONCESSIVE CONDITIONALS, respectively. According to Bakker (1988: 206f.), the main semantic difference between concessive conditionals and concessives is that the latter are factual whereas the former need not be and typically are not. König (1985: 4) states that the truth of concessive conditionals requires that the consequent be true, and for this reason Haspelmath & König (1998: 567) call them semifactual. However, in an endnote König (1988: 164) concedes that this statement holds true only for the first two types. Haspelmath & König (1998: 572f.) explain that the level on which the clauses are linked is an important factor for the truth conditions of the whole sentence. Based on Sweetser (1990), Haspelmath & König (1998: 568–570) introduce these levels as another parameter according to which concessive conditionals can be distinguished. This can be the “content level”, the “epistemic level” and the “illocutionary level”. Haspelmath & König (1998: 563, 569f.) give the following English examples for concessive conditionals:

(197) *Even if we do not get any financial support, we will go ahead with our project.*

(198) *Even if this had not been his intention, he certainly managed to alienate most of his colleagues.*

(199) *Even if you don't want to hear this, your mother is waiting for you.*

Even though these are all instances of scalar concessive conditionals, the entities that they connect are quite distinct. The first sentence exhibits “linking at the content level”. The situation in the consequent will take place regardless of the situation in the antecedent. With respect to the second sentence, Haspelmath & König (1998: 569) explain that “the relevant connectives establish a link between a conclusion (expressed by the main clause) and aspects of knowledge brought into the discussion as possible evidence for the conclusion (linking at the epistemic level)”. In the third example, the speaker explicitly disregards a condition that might be important regarding the utterance of the main clause, which is a case of “linking at the illocutionary level” (Haspelmath & König 1998: 570).²⁰⁸ As for the truth conditions of the whole sentence containing a concessive conditional, Haspelmath & König (1998: 572f.) explain, that just like all alternative and universal concessive conditionals, scalar concessive conditionals that are linked on the epistemic and illocutionary level entail their consequents. Among those that are linked on the content level, some entail their consequent whereas others do not. As one important factor Haspelmath & König name the focus of the additive operator, but since they do not examine this issue in detail due to its complexity, I will not treat it here either.

The three types of linking that I have just discussed can be expressed not only by scalar concessive conditionals but also by the other two subtypes (see Haspelmath & König 1998: 563, 569f. for examples). In addition to conditionals and concessive conditionals, which Haspelmath & König (1998: 568–570) discuss, these levels can also be observed within concessives. For illustrative examples see Sweetser (1990: 78f.).

With respect to the investigation of *cid*, concessives, concessive conditionals and conditionals are relevant because of their relationship with focus particles. According to König (1985: 10f.), concessive conjunctions etymologically or synchronically often consist of additive particles and conditional or temporal conjunctions and also the third type of concessive conditionals in ex. (196) involves a scalar particle (cf. Forker 2016: 77f.). Hence, even though the three categories discussed thus far are semantically different, there need not be a formal distinction between them. König (1988: 152) observes that it is a common phenomenon for languages to have a construction which is used to express both concessives and concessive conditionals. Nevertheless, König & Eisenberg (1984: 322f.) draw a synchronic distinction

²⁰⁸ On causal links at the illocutionary level in Vedic see Lühr (2004).

between concessive conjunctions and concessive conditional conjunctions. They only regard those conjunctions as concessive that not only allow but force a concessive interpretation.

Viti (2007: 187–195) also labels cases as concessive in which *cid* is simply used as a scalar additive particle, like for instance in ex. (34) in Section 4.1 (cf. also Viti 2008a: 397). In principle, she is correct in doing so, because “[c]oncession is always present, whether actual or potential, in scalar expressions [...], because there is always a conflict, overt or covert, between a scalar expression and its scope” (Bakker 1988: 49). However, I will use the term CONCESSIVE only to refer to the relation of two clauses (as above in this section) or to describe the semantic relationship between a main predicate and a secondary predicate (see below).²⁰⁹

4.6.2 *cid* in concessive conditional clauses

The most extensive investigation of concessivity in the Rigveda is the one by Lühr (1997). She observes that *cid* is involved in the formation of universal and scalar concessive conditionals (see also most recently Briceño Villalobos 2019: 136–142). I will begin by discussing the universal concessive conditionals and then go on to discuss *cid* in scalar concessive conditionals. After that, I will briefly discuss a possible case of a reduced alternative conditional which is marked by the employment of *cid ... cid*. For a better orientation I will provide an overview over the relevant types here.

Universal concessive conditionals can be formed by *cid* following the relative pronoun (ex. (200)) or by *cid* forming an indefinite pronoun with an interrogative in the relative clause (ex. (201)). The former pattern can also mark a concessive relation without being a universal concessive conditional (ex. (205)). Moreover, *cid* after a relative clause is also used for non-specific free relative clauses (ex. (207)). The latter type can be most clearly identified in cases where it fills a functional slot in the main clause and there is no coreferential element. The latter type is probably present when a lack of coherence can be observed between sub and main clause. There are also cases in which *cid* after a relative pronoun marks no concessive relation at all (ex. (213)) There are two cases in which *cid* can mark a universal concessive conditional with the conjunction *yáthā* ‘like’ but they are unclear.

Scalar concessive conditionals can be formed by *yád cid (hí)*, where *yád* is a conjunction ‘if/when’ and *hí* is a causal particle ‘for’. These clauses can have a factual (ex. (222)) or a non-

²⁰⁹ Note also that Haspelmath & König (1998: 592) do not consider scalarity a property of concessives but only of concessive conditionals.

factual reading (ex. (221)). In one case, a *yád cid (hí)* clause is to be interpreted as a non-specific free relative clause or a universal concessive conditional (ex (208)).

I have not found *cid* in alternative conditional clauses. However, in one case (ex. (233)) I find *cid* in a reduced alternative conditional clause. Note that *cid* is not the only means to mark concessive relation between clauses and they may even be not specifically marked at all. For examples of concessive conditional clauses that are not marked by *cid*, I refer the reader to Lühr (1997).

4.6.2.1 Universal concessive conditionals

It has long been noted in the literature that *cid* has a ‘generalizing’ function when it follows relative pronouns (cf. Grassmann 1873: 455; Delbrück 1888: 569f.; Macdonell 1916: 231; Renou 1952: 382f.). Hence, the collocation *yá- cid* is translatable as ‘whoever, whatever’ vel sim. This function is thus comparable to the semantics of universal concessive conditionals described in the previous section. The involvement of additive particles in the marking of free-choice relative clauses is also attested outside of Vedic. For instance, Lehmann (1984: 340) refers to the German construction *was auch immer* ‘whatever’, involving the additive particle *auch* ‘also/even’. See Haspelmath & König (1998: 611) for examples from Dutch, Armenian, Modern Greek and Bulgarian. In the Rigveda, *cid* occurs 10 times after a relative pronoun. In one additional passage, the interpretation of the preceding form as a relative pronoun is uncertain (ex. (225) in Section 4.6.2.2). Lühr (1997: 66) gives the following Rigvedic text passage as an example of a universal concessive conditional:

(200) <i>yá</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>nú</i>	<i>vajrin</i>		<i>kṛṇávo</i>
REL:ACC.PL.N	PRT	now	with.mace:VOC.SG.M		do:SBJV.2SG
<i>dadhr̥ṣvān</i>			/	<i>ná</i>	<i>te</i>
be.brave:PTCP.PERF.ACT.NOM.SG.M				NEG	2SG.GEN
<i>vartá</i>		<i>táviṣyā</i>		<i>asti</i>	<i>tásyāḥ</i>
obstructor:NOM.SG.M		power:GEN.SG.F		be:3SG	DEM:GEN.SG.F

‘**Whatever** you brave one will do now, bearer of the mace, there exists no one to obstruct this power of yours.’²¹⁰

‘As for those (deeds) you will do **even** now in your daring, possessor of the mace ...’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 692) RV 5.29.14cd

Notice also the presence of the prospective subjunctive *kṛṇávas* ‘you will do’, which has a generalizing function as well (Lühr 1997: 65). Jamison & Brereton (2014: 692) interpret pāda

²¹⁰ The translation of pāda c is based on Lühr (1997: 66); the translation of pāda d is adopted from Jamison & Brereton (2014: 692).

c differently. They associate *cid* with the following *nú* rather than the preceding relative pronoun. Since *cid* usually follows the word with which it is associated and the context justifies the presence of a universal/free-choice *yá cid* ‘whatever’, I prefer the interpretation endorsed by Lühr. Hettrich (1988: 563) considers such an interpretation as plausible (“plausibel”).

In this section, I will discuss all passages in which *cid* follows a relative pronoun. Yet, before I do so, I would like to introduce another group of passages, for a relative pronoun followed by *cid* is not the only way in which this type of concessive conditional can be expressed. It can also be expressed by an interrogative proform followed by *cid* which occurs within the relative clause (Delbrück 1893–1900: I, 513; Hettrich 1988: 556f.). Lühr (1997: 67) illustrates this with the following example:

(201) <i>yó</i>	<i>naḥ</i>	<i>kás</i>		<i>cid</i>	<i>rírikṣati</i>	/
REL:NOM.SG.M	1PL.ACC	who:NOM.SG.M		PRT	harm:DES.3SG	
<i>rakṣastuvéna</i>	<i>mártiyaḥ</i>		/	<i>suvaíḥ</i>	<i>ṣá</i>	
demonry:INS.SG.N	mortal:NOM.SG.M			own:INS.PL.M	DEM:NOM.SG.M	
<i>évai</i>	<i>ririṣṣṭa</i>	<i>yúr</i>		<i>jánaḥ</i>		
device:INS.PL.M	harm:AOR.OPT.3SG	lifetime:ACC.SG.N		man:NOM.SG.M		

‘**Whatever** mortal seeks to harm us with demonry, that man should harm his own lifetime by his own devices.’ RV 8.18.13

The collocation *kás cid* is an indefinite pronoun formed according to the pattern outlined in Section 4.3.1. In contrast to ex. (200), the relative pronoun itself does not receive any overt universal or free-choice marking. Another case of this kind is RV 1.94.9 (Briceño Villalobos 2019: 139f.). In two other examples, the neuter indefinite pronoun *kád cid* (NOM/ACC.SG.N) occurs in a subclause marked by *yád*, which can be either the NOM/ACC.SG.N of the relative pronoun or a conjunction marking an adverbial subclause. Consider the following case:

(202) <i>ádite</i>	<i>mítra</i>	<i>váruṇotá</i>			
Aditi:VOC.SG.F	Mitra:VOC.SG.M	Varuṇa:VOC.SG.M			
<i>mṝla</i>	/	<i>yád</i>	<i>vo</i>	<i>vayám</i>	<i>caḥṛmá</i>
have.mercy:IMP.2SG		if	2PL.DAT	1PL.NOM	do:PERF.1PL
<i>kác</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>āgaḥ</i>			
what:ACC.SG.N	PRT	sin:ACC.SG.N			

‘O Aditi, Mitra, and Varuṇa, have mercy **if** we have committed **any** offense against you.’ RV 2.27.14ab

As can be seen in the translation given in this example, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 441) interpret *yád* as a conditional conjunction ‘if’ and translate *kád cid* as ‘any’. Hettrich (1988: 373) also names this passage in his section concerning the conjunction *yád*. If this interpretation is correct, this passage is not an example of a concessive conditional clause. Griffith (1896–1897: I, 294), however, prefers the interpretation as a universal concessive conditional, as he

translates, somewhat freely: ‘Aditi, Mitra, Varuṇa, forgive us however we have erred and sinned against you’. One might change Griffith’s version to a more literal translation: ‘Aditi, Mitra, Varuṇa, forgive us whatever sin we have committed against you’ (cf. also Macdonell [n.d.]: 28).²¹¹ Notice that apart from the reduced alternative conditional in ex. (233) below, ex. (202) would be the only example of a concessive conditional clause in which the subclause follows the main clause, if it were to be interpreted like that. The second ambiguous case is RV 1.185.8. A third similar case is RV 4.12.4. It differs from the one discussed here in so far as it contains the sequence *yád cid hí* (cf. Viti 2008a: 396), which is discussed below. This means that in this case *cid* occurs both after the conjunction/relative pronoun and in the indefinite pronoun *kád cid*. I therefore assume this to be a different construction than the one in ex. (201) and regard *yád* as a conjunction in this case, pace Lühr (1997: 73), who considers both interpretations as possible and Briceño Villalobos (2019: 137), who gives this passage as an example for a free-choice relative. The passage will be given below in ex. (225) in Section 4.6.2.2.

As a special case of a generalizing relative clause, Hettrich (1988: 557) mentions RV 10.15.6. Here, the free-choice meaning is expressed by *kéna cid* ‘any (INS)’, which occurs in the main clause and is modified by the relative clause. Notice also the different case forms of *kéna cid* (INS) and *yád ... āgas* (ACC):

(203) <i>mā</i>	<i>hiṃsiṣṭa</i>		<i>pitarah</i>	<i>kéna</i>	<i>cin</i>
NEG	harm:AOR.INJ.MID.2PL		father:VOC.PL.M	who:INS.SG.N	PRT
<i>no</i>	/	<i>yád</i>	<i>va</i>	<i>āgaḥ</i>	<i>puruṣátā</i>
1PL.ACC		REL:ACC.SG.N	2PL.DAT	sin:ACC.SG.N	human.way:INS.SG.F
	<i>kārāma</i>				
	do:AOR.SBJV.1PL				

‘Do not harm us, o forefathers, because of **any** offense that we may do to you in our human way. RV 10.15.6cd

However, since the free-choice meaning is expressed by the indefinite pronoun in the main clause rather than the relative clause, I do not treat structures like this in this section.

An interesting case to be mentioned is the following example. Here, *cid* follows both the relative *yé* and the correlative *té*:

(204) <i>yé</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>púrva</i>	<i>ṛtasāpa</i>	
REL:NOM.PL.M	PRT	for	ancient:NOM.PL.M	serving.truth:NOM.PL.M	
<i>āsan</i>	/	<i>sākāṃ</i>	<i>devébhīr</i>	<i>ávadann</i>	<i>ṛtāni</i> /
be:IPRF.3PL		together	god:INS.PL.M	speak:IPRF.3PL	truth:ACC.PL.N

²¹¹ See also Bodewitz (2019: 297) on this passage.

<i>té</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>ávāsur</i>	<i>nahí</i>	<i>ántam</i>
DEM:NOM.PL.M	PRT	LP.bind:AOR.3PL	not.for	end:ACC.SG.N

āpúh
reach:PERF.3PL

‘For **even** those ancients, **who** served truth and at one with the gods spoke truths, **even** they got out of harness, for they did not reach the end.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 380)

‘**Whatever** ancients served the truth and at one with the gods spoke truths, they **all** got out of harness ...’ (my adaptation based on Sieg 1902: 123) RV 1.179.2a–c

Schnaus (2008: 60) describes the construction *yé cid ... té cid* as syntactically clear (“syntaktisch klar”), but I am not certain what this means for the interpretation of *cid*. Geldner (1951–1957: I, 257) and Witzel & Gotō (2007: 327) treat the two instances of *cid* differently with respect to each other. They translate the first one with the scalar additive particle ‘selbst’ and the second one with the general additive particle ‘auch’.²¹² Renou (1955–1969: XVI, 94) contends that the two instances of *cid* express a strong contrast (“fort contraste”). Following Hettrich (1988: 561f.), however, it is possible to ascribe a generalizing function to *yé cid*. Such an interpretation underlies the translation by Sieg (1902: 123).²¹³ According to this interpretation, one might translate pādas a and b as ‘whatever ancients served the truth and at one with the gods spoke truths’.²¹⁴ The translation by Sieg also offers a new perspective on the interpretation of the second *cid* in the main clause, because following him, one can translate *té cid* as ‘all these’ or ‘they all’. A similar translation is given by Delbrück (1893–1900: III, 338) and this view is also represented in Grassmann (1873: 455). It matches the totalizing function of *cid* that I discussed in Section 4.4. In light of the universal concessive conditional interpretation of pādas a/b, I consider this the most plausible interpretation: Regardless of who the truth-serving ancients were, all of them got out of harness. I assume that the presence of the totalizing *cid* enhances the irrelevance of the subclause and thereby the concessive relation between the clauses.²¹⁵ The different possible interpretations of this passage show, however, that the relative–correlative construction is not as clear as Schnaus believes it to be even though she compares the translation by Sieg with other interpretations.

²¹² ‘Denn selbst die Altvorderen, die sich des Rechten befließigten und mit den Göttern rechte Reden führten, auch sie haben aufgehört, denn sie fanden nicht das Ende’ (Geldner); ‘Denn selbst die, die früheren Pfleger der Wahrheit (Ṛta) waren, (die) gemeinsam mit den Gättern die wahren (Worte) (*ṛtāni*) sprachen, auch die haben aufgehört. Sie haben ja das Ende nicht erreicht’ (Witzel & Gotō).

²¹³ ‘Denn wer immer in früherer Zeit die heilige (Büsser-)Satzung pflegte und mit den Göttern die heiligen Satzungen besprach, die alle haben (sie) aufgegeben, denn sie kamen nicht zum Ziel’

²¹⁴ In addition to a different interpretation of some lexemes, Sieg interprets *pūrve* as an event-oriented adjunct (see Casaretto 2020 on this classification) whereas I take it to be entity-denoting.

²¹⁵ Again, I do not consider this a case of genuine quantification. The meaning of the statement would be essentially the same without the second *cid*: ‘Whatever ancients served the truth and at one with the gods spoke truths, they got out of harness’. Thus, *cid* is used here only to emphasize totality.

The following example contains a pattern which formally matches ex. (200) in that it exhibits a relative pronoun followed by *cid* which expresses a concessive relation:

(205) <i>yé</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>mṛtyúbandhava</i>	/	<i>ādityā</i>
REL:NOM.PL.M	PRT	for	kinsman.of.death:NOM.PL.M		Āditya:VOC.PL.M
<i>mánavaḥ</i>		<i>smási</i> /	<i>prá</i>	<i>sú</i>	<i>na</i>
human:NOM.PL.M		be:1PL	forward	PRT	1PL.GEN
<i>āyu°</i>		<i>jīváse</i>		<i>tiretana</i>	
lifetime:ACC.SG.N		live:INF.DAT.SG		traverse:OPT.2PL	

‘For **even though** we are men, whose kinsman is death, o Ādityas, extend our lifetime for us to live.’ RV 8.18.22

The relative pronoun followed by *cid* expresses the irrelevance of the proposition in the pādas a/b to the request in pāda c. However, unlike in ex. (201), the relative clause does not allow for a universal or free-choice reading (Hettrich 1988: 561f.). Ludwig (1876–1888: V, 598) perceives an adversative reading of the emphasized relative pronoun. Schnaus (2008: 61) suggests a translation which is not concessive at all. She assumes that pādas a/b consist of a relative clause and an embedded causal *hí*-clause.²¹⁶ I do not consider this plausible, because *hí* would then occur in the first position of its clause instead of the second, which would be highly unexpected (cf. Delbrück 1888: 22f.). Moreover, this interpretation leaves the presence of *cid* unexplained. I agree with Hettrich that there is a concessive relation between the two clauses but that this relation is not expressed via universal or free-choice quantification and therefore differs from cases like ex. (200). I believe, however, that the concessive relation which *yé cid* expresses is enhanced by the presence of the particle *sú* (*sú*) in the main clause. This particle has a hortative function after imperatives (Klein 1982: 12–26) and when the Ādityas are further urged or motivated to extend the lifetime, what is said in the subclause becomes all the more irrelevant (cf. also Lühr 2009: 181f.).

Haspelmath & König (1998: 577f.) point to the fact that there is another construction which is exceedingly difficult to distinguish from universal concessive conditionals, namely non-specific free relative clauses. They give the following German examples, which exhibit a syntactic difference between the free relative clause in a. and the concessive conditional in b.:

(206) a.	<i>Wo</i>	<i>immer</i>	<i>du</i>	<i>hingehst</i>	<i>bist</i>	<i>du</i>	<i>steuerpflichtig.</i>
	where	ever	you	go	are	you	taxable
	‘Wherever you go you are liable to taxation.’						
	b.	<i>Wo</i>	<i>immer</i>	<i>du</i>	<i>hingehst,</i>	<i>du</i>	<i>bist (überall)</i>
		where	ever	you	go	you	are everywhere

²¹⁶ ‘welche wir, denn wir sind dem Tod unterworfen, Ādityas, Menschen sind’

steuerpflichtig.
taxable

‘Wherever you go, you are liable to taxation (everywhere).’

Haspelmath & König (1998: 577f.) explain that “[a] crucial difference between the two constructions is that free relatives are a constituent of the containing clause and may fill a functional slot within that clause”, but that the distinction between the two types often cannot be made by formal criteria. A clear case of a non-specific free relative clause in the Rigveda is the following example:

(207) *ávardhan* *vájā* *utá* *yé* *cid* *átra*
strengthen:3PL Vāja:NOM.PL.M and REL:NOM.PL.M PRT there

‘The Vājas and **whatever** (others) were there strengthened (you).’ RV 10.73.3b

The relative clause *yé cid átra* ‘whoever was there’ is non-specific. Furthermore, it does not have a correlative pronoun in the main clause. Syntactically, it constitutes the second conjunct of the subject. As a result, it matches the classification of a non-specific free relative clause by Haspelmath & König. Compare this with ex. (200) above, where there is no functional slot left to be filled in the main clause, with or without the preceding relative clause, so that pāda a can be identified as a concessive conditional clause.²¹⁷ Notice that also in ex. (200), as in the b. sentence of the German ex. (206), no coreferential element is required in the main clause. In ex. (201), however, it is in fact the presence of the full nominal expression *sá jánas* ‘this man’ in the main clause that leads to an interpretation of a concessive conditional rather than a free relative clause. For the slot of the subject would be filled even without the presence of the relative clause. Since in ex. (204) *cid* occurs both after the relative and the correlative pronoun, I consider this to be a concessive conditional as well. This is, of course, only under the assumption that the first *cid* is not used as a regular scalar additive particle as Jamison & Brereton interpret it. In the following example, it is probably the very distinction between universal concessive conditionals and non-specific free relative clauses which has caused discord with respect to its interpretation. This is the only example in which the sequence *yád cid hí* allows a universal or free-choice reading:

(208) *yác* *cid* *dhí* *te* *gaṇā́* *imé* /
when PRT for 2SG.DAT throng:NOM.PL.M DEM:NOM.PL.M

chadáyanti *maghátaye* / *pári* *cid* *váṣṭayo*
appear:3PL giving:DAT.SG.F around PRT eager:NOM.PL.M

dadhur / *dádato* *rádho*
put:PERF.3PL give:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.PL.M benefit:ACC.SG.N

²¹⁷ Hettrich (1988: 568) list this example among the text passages which exhibit no gender agreement between the relative pronoun and the correlative noun.

áhrayaṃ

immoderate:ACC.SG.N

‘For **whenever** these throngs appear to you (fit) for the giving of bounties, eager, they surround those who give immoderate benefit [=patrons]’ RV 5.79.5a–d

Unlike the *yád cid hí* clauses I will discuss in Section 4.6.2.2, this is not an instance of a scalar concessive conditional. Hettrich (1988: 329–331) does not see any concessive meaning in this text passage. Lühr (1997: 71) disagrees with him and analyzes it as a universal concessive conditional. The two opposing views can be explained by the formal similarity of free non-specific relative clauses, where there is no concessive meaning present, and universal concessive conditionals. Hettrich’s view corresponds to that of a free non-specific relative clause whereas Lühr, as she herself states, regards this passage as a universal concessive conditional. I do not see any formal means which might facilitate the identification of the clause type. Unfortunately, it is hardly possible to arrive at a certain conclusion on semantic grounds, for as Hettrich admits, this text passage is rather unclear (cf. Caland & Henry 1907: 446f.; Oldenberg 1909–1912: I, 364f.; Geldner 1951–1957: II, 84; Renou 1955–1969: III, 78; 80; Witzel et al. 2013: 331f.; 624; Jamison comm.V: ad loc.). Notice, however, that the syntax of Lühr’s German translation corresponds to that of the free relative clause in the a. sentence of ex. (206), contrary to the interpretation that she endorses.²¹⁸ Due to the uncertainty regarding this text passage, it is also difficult to determine the function of *cid* after the local particle *pári* in the main clause (cf. Section 4.1).

Being aware of the distinction between concessive conditionals and non-specific free relative clauses may also help to understand the following text passage:

(209) <i>yé</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>tvám</i>	<i>ṛṣayaḥ</i>	<i>púrva</i>
REL:NOM.PL.M	PRT	for	2SG.ACC	seer:NOM.PL.M	previous:NOM.PL.M
<i>ūtáye</i>	/	<i>juhūré</i>		<i>ávase</i>	<i>mahi</i> /
help:DAT.SG.F		call:PERF.MID.3PL		help:DAT.SG.N	great:VOC.SG.M
<i>sá</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>stómāṃ</i>	<i>abhí</i>	<i>grṇīhi</i>	
DEM:NOM.SG.M	1PL.GEN	praise:ACC.PL.M	LP	praise:IMP.2SG	
<i>rādhasā</i>					
generosity:INS.SG.N					

‘Because **even** those previous seers **who** called upon you for aid, for help, o great one—do you (now) greet our praises (as you did theirs) with generosity’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 161)

‘**Whatever** previous seers called upon you for aid, for help, o great one, do you greet our praises with generosity’ (my adaptation) RV 1.48.14a–c

²¹⁸ ‘Sooft auch diese (Sänger)Scharen dir (würdig) erscheinen, beschenkt zu werden, haben sie [die Patrone] [sie] in jedem Fall bereitwillig bedacht, indem sie ein großzügiges Geschenk gaben’.

Jamison & Brereton (2014: 161) do not interpret this passage as an instance of a universal concessive conditional.²¹⁹ Jamison (comm.I.1: ad loc.) explains that the subclause “has no explicit referent in the main clause” (see also Delbrück 1893–1900: III, 338). Geldner (1951–1957: I, 60) therefore speaks of a peculiar use of the relative pronoun (“Zu dem eigentümlichen Gebrauch des Relativs”). Delbrück (1874: 3) even considers emending *yé* to *yád* ‘if/when’. This is, however, correctly rejected by Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 47f.). According to Hettrich (1988: 561f.), a generalizing interpretation of *yé cid* (‘welche Ṛṣis auch immer ...’) is possible in this text passage and he (1988: 621) also assigns it a concessive meaning, which suggests an interpretation as a universal concessive conditional. In light of this analysis, the missing referent in the main clause is not surprising anymore, for with the German concessive conditional in ex. (206), the presence of a correlative element in the main clause is not necessary either. I consider this interpretation more advantageous than the one by Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 47f.), followed by Witzel & Gotō (2007: 92, 576), who assumes that the poet continued the sentence differently than he actually intended (cf. also Renou 1955–1969: III, 26).²²⁰

As in the previous example, the distinction between concessive conditionals and non-specific free-relative clauses may also be a valuable guide for the following text passage, although the problems regarding the interpretation are more severe in this case:

(210) <i>yás</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>tvā</i>	<i>bahúbhya</i>	<i>á</i>	/
REL:NOM.SG.M	PRT	for	2SG.ACC	many:ABL.PL.M	LP	
<i>sutávāṃ</i>			<i>āvívāsati</i>	/	<i>ugráṃ</i>	
with.pressed.soma:NOM.SG.M			entice:DESID.3SG		powerful:ACC.SG.N	
<i>tát</i>	<i>patyate</i>	<i>śáva</i>		<i>índro</i>	<i>aṅgá</i>	
DEM:ACC.SG.N	rule:MID.3SG	strength:ACC.SG.N		Indra.NOM.SG.M	PRT	

‘For **someone who** has pressed soma seeks to entice you here, away from the many. He has control of powerful strength – Indra indeed!’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 213)

‘For **whoever** tries to win you over from the many, having pressed soma, – Indra owns this powerful strength (as you know)’²²¹ RV 1.84.9

In this example, *pādas* a/b constitute a relative clause that is introduced by *yás cid hí* and *pāda* c, or perhaps rather the first three words of c, constitutes the main clause. Nevertheless, the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 213), which is given in the example, suggests a

²¹⁹ Cf. also Kümmel (2000: 606): ‘Denn da dich auch die früheren Ṛṣis (immer) zur Unterstützung angerufen haben, zur Hilfe, [du] Große, so belohne unsere Preislieder durch Schenkung’ (I have not adopted his boldface type).

²²⁰ Witzel & Gotō (2007: 92) translate ‘So viele Ṛṣis auch dich früher zur Gunst, zur Hilfe angerufen haben, du Große, so ehre unsere Preislieder durch deine Gunst’ and they (2007: 576) paraphrase this translation as ‘Wie die früheren Ṛṣis dich gerufen haben, die hast du erhört; so erhöere jetzt uns’. As in example (205), I also reject the translation by Schnaus (2008: 61), who assumes an embedded *hí*-clause.

²²¹ The translation mostly follows Geldner (1951–1957: I, 107), but the translation of *aṅgá* as ‘(as you know)’ is based on Coenen (2023).

different syntactic structure, for they translate the predicate *āvívāsati* ‘he seeks to entice’ as though it were a main clause predicate and their translation starts a new sentence in the beginning of pāda c. Jamison (comm.I.1: ad loc.) explains that she considers this stanza to be a “broken construction” because there is no grammatical link between pādas a/b, which should be interpreted as a relative clause, and pāda c. As a result, she “take[s] *yás cid* as the functional equivalent of the indefinite *kás cid*”, i.e. an indefinite pronoun ‘some/any(one)’ (cf. Section 4.3.1). It is true that a translation that follows Geldner (1951–1957: I, 107) and Witzel & Gotō (2007: 149), who treat pāda c as the main clause of pādas a/b, appears to exhibit a lack of coherence: ‘For whoever tries to win you over from the many, having pressed soma, – only Indra owns this powerful strength’ (cf. also Lühr 1997: 67).²²² Geldner himself therefore perceives “[I]eichte Anakolouthie” and suggests as an alternative solution that the form *yás* may be the result of a case attraction like the one he assumes for ex. (214) below. The most striking peculiarity that Jamison (comm.I.1: ad loc.) points at is that Indra is both the referent of the object *tvā* ‘you’ in the relative clause and the third person subject of the main clause. However, under the assumption that the subclause in pādas a/b is in fact a free-choice concessive conditional clause (cf. Hettrich 1988: 561f.; 621), at least from a syntactic point of view, its loose connection to the main clause in c is not very surprising, as a comparison of the two sentences in the German ex. (206) shows and as can also be seen in ex. (209) above. It is not untypical for concessive conditionals to appear as though they were somewhat disconnected from the main clause. For in the b. sentence of ex. (206), the predicate occurs in the second position of the main clause whereas its usual position is in the first position when the main clause is preceded by a subordinate clause. Thus, König & van der Auwera (1988: 118), who investigate the integration of concessive, conditional and concessive conditional clauses in German and Dutch, make the following observation regarding the latter type: “When the antecedent is specified by a free-choice expression, non-integration is required in Dutch, and preferred in German”. It may be true that ex. (210) is a more extreme case of disintegration than e.g. ex. (200) but in my opinion an interpretation as a universal concessive conditional is by no means impossible. I surmise that ex. (210) is intended to express that whoever tries to win the favor of Indra should be aware that even if Indra favors him, he will never be as strong as Indra himself. Notice that a change from second to third person as the referring expression to the addressee of a hymn is not untypical in the Rigveda. Even though I consider Geldner’s

²²² ‘Denn wer auch bei gepreßtem Soma dich den vielen (Wettbewerbern) abzugewinnen sucht – diese gewaltige Macht besitzt einzig Indra’ (Geldner); ‘Wer auch immer dich den vielen (Wettbewerbern) mit gepreßtem (Soma) abzugewinnen versucht, – über diese gewaltige Macht herrscht eigentlich Indra’ (Witzel & Gotō).

translation, an English adaptation of which I give in the example, to be plausible, a note on the position of *aṅgá* is necessary. The fact that it usually occurs in Wackernagel position suggests that there is a clause boundary before *índras*, as Jamison & Brereton assume in their translation. Accordingly, one might translate pāda c as ‘he (= Indra) owns this powerful strength. (It is) Indra (as you know)’. On the syntax and function of *aṅgá* in this passage see Coenen (2023: 152f.; 171–173).

Three cases that are different from the text passages discussed thus far are the following ones. Here, a relative pronoun is followed by *cid* but there seems to be neither a concessive nor another universal or non-specific reading present:

(211) <i>nadáṃ</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>bhinnám</i>	<i>amuyá</i>	<i>śáyānam</i>	/
reed:ACC.SG.M	like	split:PPP.ACC.SG.M	in.that.way	lie:PTCP.PRS.MID.ACC.SG.M	
<i>máno</i>		<i>rúhāṇā</i>		<i>áti</i>	<i>yanti</i>
Manu:GEN.SG.M		climb:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.PL.F		LP	go:3SG
<i>ápaḥ</i>	/				
water:NOM.PL.F					
<i>yás</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>vṛtró</i>	<i>mahinā</i>	<i>paryátiṣṭhat</i>	/
REL:ACC.PL.F	PRT	Vṛtra:NOM.SG.M	greatness:INS.SG.M	surround:IPRF.3SG	
<i>tásām</i>	<i>áhiḥ</i>		<i>patsutaḥśír</i>	<i>babhūva</i>	
DEM:GEN.PL.F	serpent:NOM.SG.M		at.feet:NOM.SG.M	be:PERF.3SG	

‘*Delivering themselves to Manu, the waters go over him like a split reed—lying in that way. **Those very ones whom** Vṛtra in his greatness once surrounded—at *their* feet lay the serpent.’²²³ RV 1.32.8

(212) <i>yás</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>ápo</i>	<i>mahinā</i>	<i>paryápaśyad</i>	/
REL:NOM.SG.M	PRT	water:ACC.PL.F	greatness:INS.SG.M	survey:IPRF.3SG	
<i>dákṣaṃ</i>	<i>dádhanā</i>		<i>janáyantīr</i>		
skill:ACC.SG.M	take:PTCP.PRS.MID.ACC.PL.F		give.birth:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.PL.F		
<i>yajñám</i>	/	<i>yó</i>	<i>devésv</i>	<i>ádhi</i>	<i>devá</i>
sacrifice:ACC.SG.M		REL:NOM.SG.M	god:LOC.PL.M LP	LP	god:NOM.SG.M
<i>éka</i>	<i>ásīt</i>	/	<i>kásmāi</i>	<i>deváya</i>	
one:NOM.SG.M	be:IPRF.3SG		who:DAT.SG.M	god:DAT.SG.M	
<i>haviṣā</i>		<i>vidhema</i>			
oblation:INS.SG.N		worship:AOR.OPT.1PL			

‘**Who** by his greatness surveyed the waters receiving (ritual) skill (as an embryo) and giving birth to the sacrifice; who, the god over gods, alone existed. – Who is the god to whom we should do homage with our oblation?’ RV 10.121.8

(213) <i>yé</i>	<i>cit</i>	<i>púrva</i>	<i>ṛtasāpa</i>	/
REL:NOM.PL.M	PRT	ancient:NOM.PL.M	serving.truth:NOM.PL.M	

²²³ On *máno rúhāṇā* see Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 32f.) and Geldner (1951–1957: I, 37f.).

<i>ṛtāvāna</i>	<i>ṛtāvṛdhaḥ</i>	/	<i>pitṛn</i>	
truthful:NOM.PL.M	strong.by.truth:NOM.PL.M		father:ACC.PL.M	
<i>tāpasvato</i>	<i>yama</i>	/	<i>tāmś</i>	<i>cid</i> <i>evāpi</i>
fervent:ACC.PL.M	Yama:VOC.SG.M		DEM.ACC.PL.M	PRT PRT+LP
[= <i>evā āpi</i>]	<i>gachatāt</i>			
	go:IMP.3SG			

‘Also those ancients **who** were servers of truth, truthful, strong through truth, the forefathers full of fervor, o Yama—**right** to them let him go now.’ RV 10.154.4

Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 19) does not ascribe *cid* a generalizing function in exx. (211) and (212). As for ex. (211), Hettrich (1988: 563) considers such a function to be possible but not preferable, but regarding ex. (212) he rejects this interpretation too. Hettrich does not discuss ex. (213) in his study. I follow Oldenberg in assuming that the relative clause in ex. (211) is neither a universal concessive conditional nor a non-specific free relative clause, because the referents are in fact specific. The feminine gender of the relative pronoun shows that the referents are the *āpas* ‘waters (NOM.PL.F)’ that are mentioned in the previous hemistich (cf. Jamison & Brereton 2014: 134).²²⁴ The question is then which function *cid* fulfills in this and the other two examples. According to Geldner (1907–1909: I, 63), *cid* is used in ex. (211) to emphasize the coreferentiality of the relative clause and the correlative pronoun and offers the translation ‘gerade die’ or ‘dieselben welche’ for this construction (see also Lanman 1912: 156).²²⁵ This is in accordance with the translation ‘those very ones’ by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 135). As I will argue in Section 4.8, *cid* can be used as an exclusive particle or an emphasizer, so that this interpretation is in accordance with further data from the Rigveda.

A possible solution for ex. (212) is to assume that *cid* exhibits unusual syntax here and that it is actually associated not with the relative pronoun but with a following expression. Thus, Müller (1891: 2) translates pādas a/b as ‘He who by his might looked even over the waters which held power (the germ) and generated the sacrifice (light)’, which suggests that he believes *cid* to be associated with the complex nominal expression whose head is *āpas* ‘waters’. A similar interpretation is found in Grassmann (1876–1877: II, 399), Ludwig (1876–1888: II, 576), Geldner (1951–1957: III, 348), Lommel (1955: 119) and Thieme (1964: 70).²²⁶ In such an interpretation, *cid* just happens to stand after the relative pronoun. I consider this possible

²²⁴ Nevertheless, Delbrück (1893–1900: III, 338) gives this passage as an example for the generalizing function of *cid* after relatives: ‘welche (Wasser) auch Vṛtra mit seiner Macht umschlossen gehalten hatte, zu deren Füßen lag die Schlange’.

²²⁵ In his translation Geldner (1951–1957: I, 38) leaves *cid* untranslated: ‘Die ein Vṛtra in seiner Größe umlagert hatte, zu deren Füßen lag der Drache’.

²²⁶ ‘Der auch die Wasser mächtig überschaute’ (Grassmann); ‘Der in seiner Größe sogar die Gewässer überschaute’ (Geldner); ‘Der sogar die Gewässer mit seiner Größe überschaute’ (Lommel); ‘der auch die Wasser durch seine Größe überblickte’ (Thieme).

but I would like to suggest another interpretation here. A conspicuous fact about this hymn is that all stanzas except the last one, which according to Oldenberg (1888: 248) was originally not part of the hymn, end with the question in pāda d. Stanzas 2–8 share a further parallel structure, namely that the pādas a–c consist of one or more relative clauses that characterize the god whose identity is asked for. Only stanza 7, i.e. the one before the stanza in ex. (212), is an exception because it contains a temporal subclause in pādas a/b and a main clause in pāda c. As a result, it is possible that *cid* is used here not as an additive particle the scope of which is the clause, but on a larger scale to signal that the structure of the previous stanzas, which has been interrupted, is resumed here and that another characterization of the god whose identity is asked for is added here to the previous ones.

A special feature of ex. (213), like of ex. (204), is that *cid* occurs both after the relative and the correlative pronoun. However, it is important to mention that pāda d, i.e. the main clause, is repeated in all three previous stanzas of the hymn. In all of these stanzas, *tān* is coreferential with one or more relative clauses. It is only the fifth and last stanza that contains a main clause with different wording, although the content is essentially the same. According to Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1638), “[e]ach [stanza of the hymn] describes the character and habits of the distinguished forefathers now resident in the other world, and ends with a refrain urging the dead man to go and join them there”. These characters and habits are described in relative clauses. As for the stanza in ex. (213), Jamison & Brereton’s translation suggests that they assume *cid* in pāda a to function as a non-scalar additive particle (‘also’), the focus of which is the entire relative clause apart from the relative pronoun and *pūrvē* ‘ancestors’. The latter word is in the background because all previous stanzas deal with different properties of the ancestors; the relative pronoun is coreferential with the ancestors. Therefore, the ancestor’s properties are the relevant alternatives. The assumption that *cid* functions as a non-scalar additive particle is justifiable because this stanza adds another group of ancestors to the ones characterized previously.²²⁷ The question is, however, why *cid* is placed in the fourth of five stanzas of the hymn and not somewhere else. At least part of the answer might be that although all stanzas of this hymn deal with the ancestors, the word *pūrvē* is mentioned explicitly for the first time here. Thus, *cid* may be used to make clear that his relative clause refers to another distinct group of the ancestors and does not refer to all of them. A further problem is the function of the second *cid* in the main clause in pāda d. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1638) interpret it

²²⁷ In the dedication of his book, Lommel (1955) appears to interpret *cid* primarily as a connective, for he translates ‘Und jene, die vor alters Recht und Wahrheit geachtet und geübt und noch vermehrt, [...] zu denen, auch zu denen soll er eingehen’.

differently from the one in pāda a, as they render it in English as ‘right’. A similar interpretation of the two instances of *cid* can already be found in Ludwig (1876–1888: II, 394).²²⁸ The different treatment of the two instances of *cid* is justified because in pāda d *cid* does not occur alone but is followed by another particle, *evá*.²²⁹ Hence, it is not clear whether the relative-correlative structure can be compared to the one in ex. (204), where I argue for the plausibility of assuming that the *cid* in the main clause has a collective or totalizing function when the subclause is interpreted as a universal concessive conditional clause.²³⁰ Nevertheless, I believe that a totalizing interpretation of the second *cid* is possible so that one might translate ‘right to all these let him go now’. In contrast, Geldner (1951–1957: III, 385) translates *cid* as ‘also’ (‘auch’), which is justified because this hymn refers to different groups of ancestors, each of which are referred to by *tán* in stanzas 1–4, respectively.²³¹ Hence, *cid* might express emphatic coordination as in ex. (83) of Section 4.2. What speaks against this interpretation is, however, that particularly the stanza that follows ex. (213), i.e. the last stanza of the hymn, does not contain *cid* in the main clause, so that I prefer the totalizing interpretation.

There is one further case which may fall under the category of exx. (211)–(213) but whose syntactic and semantic interpretation poses several problems, on account of which Hettrich (1988: 561) excludes it from his discussion of the passages containing *yá- cid*:

(214) <i>yás</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>itthá</i>	<i>bhágaḥ</i>	/
REL:NOM.SG.M	PRT	for	2SG.DAT	PRT	fortune:NOM.SG.M	
<i>śásamānáḥ</i>			<i>purá</i>	<i>nidáḥ</i>		/
work:PTCP.PERF.MID.NOM.SG.M			before	reproach:ABL.SG.F		
<i>adveṣó</i>		<i>hástayor</i>		<i>dadhé</i>		//
without.hate:ACC.SG.N		hand:LOC.DU.M		take:PERF.MID.3SG		
<i>bhágabhaktasya</i>		<i>te</i>		<i>vayám</i>	/	<i>úd</i>
apportioned.by.Bhaga:GEN.SG.N		2SG.GEN		1PL.NOM		LP
<i>aśema</i>	<i>távāvasā</i>			/	<i>mūrdhānaṃ</i>	
reach:AOR.OPT.1PL	2SG.GEN+help:INS.SG.N				head:ACC.SG.M	
<i>rāyá</i>	<i>ārabhe</i>					
wealth:GEN.SG.M	grab:INF.DAT.SG					

‘4. For **also the one who** is Fortune [/Bhaga], laboring correctly for you ahead of reproach, has received freedom from hatred in his hands.

²²⁸ ‘auch die die ersten beobachter der heiligen gesetze, heilig, stärker des gesetzes, | die tapasreichen väter, Yama, zu eben denen soll es widerkeren’.

²²⁹ In this passage, *ápi* functions as a local particle, not as a focus particle or discourse marker (RIVELEX II, 286f.).

²³⁰ In Lommel’s dedication, the *cid* (*evá*) in the main clause of stanza 4 is rendered as the additive ‘auch’ whereas the one of stanza 3 is rendered as the interjection ‘ja’. Geldner (1907–1909: I, 63) treats ex. (213) equally to ex. (211). In his glossary Lanman (1912: 156) renders the combination *yé cid ... tán cid* in this passage as ‘whatsoever ∴, unto all those’.

²³¹ ‘auch zu diesen soll er gelangen’.

5. We would reach upward to (a portion) of that apportioned by Bhaga through your help, in order to take hold of the head of wealth.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 120)

‘4. For **whatever** Bhaga, who is so wide, protected from reproach, unchallenged, holds in his hands for you...’²³² RV 1.24.4–5

Jamison & Brereton (2014: 120) interpret *cid* similarly to ex. (213), i.e. as an additive particle whose focus is the entire relative clause. As for the syntactic boundaries, they assume that the relative clause comprises *pādas* a/b of stanza 4 while the main clause comprises *pāda* c. This is not unproblematic because one would expect the finite verb *dadhé* ‘he has received’ to be unaccented when it occurs in the main clause (Ludwig 1876–1888: IV, 83). Maybe they ascribe the accent somehow to the presence of *hī* in the relative clause, but since the current version of their commentary (Jamison comm.I.1) does not yet contain a discussion of this stanza, I cannot be certain about this. Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 19) contemplates a similar interpretation and suggests that the accent on *dadhé* could be deleted, but he rejects this as a “Notbehelf”. Therefore, Ludwig (1876–1888: I, 97) Grassmann (1876–1877: II, 442), Hillebrandt (1913: 74) Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 19f.) Geldner (1951–1957: I, 25), Renou (1955–1969: V, 94) and Witzel & Gotō (2007: 44) assume different clause boundaries. They assume that the relative clause comprises the entire stanza 4 while stanza 5 constitutes the main clause.²³³ Griffith (1896–1897: I, 30f.) construes stanza 4 with stanza 3 but this is rejected by Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 19f.). However, the interpretations that construe stanza 4 with stanza 5 are not certain, either. Following the commentaries by Oldenberg and Renou, one of the major problems of this passage lies in the interpretation of *bhāgas* either as an entity-denoting nominal ‘fortune, portion’ or as the theonym Bhaga. Geldner, who opts for the theonym, has to assume a case attraction to explain the nominative *yās* instead of the expected accusative *yām* or *yād*.²³⁴

²³² The translation follows Geldner (1951–1957: I, 25).

²³³ ‘welcher anteil immer hier, geopfert noch ehe tadel kam, | unverhaszt in deine hände ward gelegt, möchten wir durch deine gnade es erlangen, deines von Bhaga geschenkten | reichthums scheidel zu erfassen’ (Ludwig); ‘Denn welcher Antheil, vor Schmähern wohl gesichert, unangefehdet, nur irgend in deine Hände gelegt ist, Den von den Göttern zugetheilten mögen wir durch deine Hülfe erlangen, um des Reichthums Gipfel zu ergreifen’ (Grassmann); ‘Welches Glück auch immer in deine Hand gelegt ist, wirksam, frei von Neid, frei von Feindschaft: möchten wir durch deine Hilfe es erreichen, daß wir den durch das Glück zugetheilten Reichtum am Schopfe fassen’ (Hillebrandt).

‘Denn was auch der so bereite Bhaga für dich, vor Tadel geschützt, unangefochten, in den Händen hält, Möchten wir mit deinem Beistand hinaufreichen, um das Oberste des von Bhaga ausgetheilten Reichtums zu erfassen’ (Geldner);

‘La Fortune quelle qu’elle soit, se reposant ainsi (que nous voyons), à l’abri de l’envie, qui/ a été placée entre (tes) mains en sorte d’écarter l’inimitié, puissions-nous y accéder-par-en-haut, grâce à ton aide (, ô Savitr,) en sorte de saisir/ le sommet de la richesse répartie par toi (comme effet) de la Fortune !’ (Renou);

‘Denn welcher (Gott) »Zuteiler« (Bhaga) für dich sich abmühend im Schutz vor Tadel ohne Haß (Reichtum) in die Hände genommen hat, (so) möchten wir, vom durch Bhaga ausgeteilt (Reichtum), mit deiner Hilfe erreichen, das Haupt des Reichtums zu erfassen’ (Witzel & Gotō).

Oldenberg contemplates several different translations.

²³⁴ Wackernagel & Debrunner (1930: 553) believe that *yās cid* ist the result of wrong transmission and read *yác cid* instead.

According to Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 20) this is possible but he considers changing *yás* to *yám* or *yád* unnecessary; Renou (1955–1969: VII, 72) regards the assumption of case attraction as unfavorable. The translations by Grassmann, Geldner and Renou suggest a universal concessive conditional character of the clause in stanza 4, as do some of the several possible translations that Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 19f.) contemplates. However, referring to the text passages in exx. (211) and (212), Oldenberg surmises that *cid* might not have a generalizing value here. He then suggests a translation with *bhágas* as a theonym, in which he does not render *cid* at all.²³⁵ Another translation that does not render *cid* is Thieme (1953: 399).²³⁶ Even if one opts for a universal/free-choice interpretation of *cid*, the semantic and syntactic problems of this passage make it difficult to decide whether stanza 4 is a non-specific free relative clause or a universal concessive conditional clause.

Thus far, I have discussed those cases in which *cid* follows the relative pronoun and examined whether this collocation expresses a universal concessive conditional or not. In addition, I have discussed the one case in which the collocation *yád cid (hí)* is potentially used in such a construction. Another subordinating conjunction which occurs with *cid*, but which Lühr (1997) does not discuss, is the modal conjunction *yáthā* ‘like’. Throughout the Rigveda, the collocation *yáthā cid* occurs 9 times. Among these, there are, however, only two instances in which an interpretation as a concessive conditional is possible. The first is ex. (215):

(215) <i>yáthā</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>mányase</i>	<i>hṛdā</i>	/	<i>tád</i>
like	PRT	think:PRS.MID.2SG	heart:INS.SG.N		DEM:ACC.SG.N
<i>ín</i>	<i>me</i>	<i>jagmur</i>	<i>āsásah</i>		
PRT	1SG.GEN	go:PERF:3PL	hope:NOM.PL.F		

‘**Just as** you [=Agni? poet?] conceive with your heart, in the same way my hopes have gone.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 735)

‘**However** you conceive with your heart, ...’ (my adaptation)²³⁷ RV 5.56.2ab

With respect to this example, I do not follow the interpretation by Witzel et al. (2013: 302; 597).²³⁸ Instead, I believe that this sentence can be translated as ‘However you conceive with your heart, in the same way my hopes have gone’,²³⁹ meaning that no matter how difficult it

²³⁵ ‘Denn der (Gott) Bhaga, der in Wahrheit für dich sich mühend ... (Reichtum) in seine Hände genommen hat – deines von (diesem) Bhaga zugeteilten Reichtums Antlitz zu erfassen (vgl. IX, 73, 1; X, 8, 3) mögen wir durch deine Gnade erreichen’

²³⁶ ‘Der Wohlstand, der so [dass er] zur Ruhe gekommen [ist] vor der [scheelsüchtigen] Schmähung, [so, dass er] ohne Feind [ist], in deine [schützenden] Hände genommen ist’ (Thieme).

²³⁷ Cf. Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 208): ‘Wie du auch meinst in deinem Sinn, so drangen meine Wünsche vor’.

²³⁸ ‘Weil man ja von dir denkt, du habest ein Herz, genau deshalb haben sich meine Einladungen in Gang gesetzt’; literally ‘wie du gedacht wirst mit Herz’.

²³⁹ Gonda (1954–1955: 282) also believes that *yáthā cid* has “‘indefinite’ value” but he believes that this is the result of an indefinite meaning of *cid* alone. On the free-choice interpretation of *yáthā cid* cf. also Wilson (1857: 336), the remaining interpretation of whom I do not follow: ‘In whatever manner though honourest the (MARUTS, AGNI), in thy heart, may they come to me as benefactors’.

may be for me, I follow you nevertheless. Yet, as I will argue in Section 5.3, *cid* can be interpreted as intensificatory in combination with *yáthā*. This interpretation is also possible in this case, as the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 735), which is given in ex. (215), shows (cf. also Geldner 1951–1957: II, 64).²⁴⁰ In this particular example, Hettrich (1988: 274; 456f.) regards both interpretations as possible, but he argues that since *yáthā cid* in some cases cannot be ‘generalizing’ and since nowhere is it compelling to interpret it in this way, *cid* is never ‘generalizing’ after *yáthā*. It is interesting that the correlative pronoun *tád* is followed by the particle *íd*, one of whose main functions it is to emphatically assert the identity of two elements (cf. Section 5.2). This points to the interpretation by Jamison & Brereton because the combination of *cid* after the conjunction and *íd* after the resumptive pronoun might be used to emphasize the identity of the subclause and the way in which the poet’s heart goes even more than a single intensificatory *cid* or a single *íd*. However, *íd* may also be used in its exclusive function (cf. Section 5.1). Later in this section, I will discuss cases in which the presence of exclusive *íd* in the main clause serves to emphasize the irrelevance of the concessive conditional clause. At first sight, this does not seem to be a proper interpretation of ex. (215) because the way the addressee conceives with his heart appears to be especially important to the speaker. Nevertheless, the irrelevance of the subclause may be exactly what is expressed here. The speaker may express that no matter how the heart of the addressee conceives, even if it might be very unpleasant for him, his hopes have never gone another way. As a result, the interpretation of this text passage has to remain unclear, especially because this is the only instance in the Rigveda in which a conjunction is followed by *cid* and the resumptive element in the main clause by *íd*.

The second example of this kind is rather curious. In this text passage *yáthā cid* probably has the meaning of a free-choice quantifier, but it appears to be used as an adverb rather than a conjunction (cf. Grassmann 1873: 1084):

(216) <i>kuvíd</i>	<i>aṅgá</i>	<i>práti</i>	<i>yáthā cid</i>	<i>asyá</i>	<i>naḥ</i>	/
PRT	PRT	LP	like	DEM:GEN.SG.N	1SG.GEN	
<i>sajātíyasya</i>			<i>maruto</i>		<i>búbodhatha</i>	
common.birth:GEN.SG.N			Marut:VOC.PL.M		perceive:PERF.SBJV.2PL	

‘Surely **in some way** you will take notice of this common birth of ours, Maruts?’ RV 10.64.13ab

Hettrich (1988: 456f.) does not include this passage in his investigation of *yáthā cid* clauses.²⁴¹ Nonetheless, the apparent adverbial use may be explained by assuming that *yáthā cid* is here a

²⁴⁰ See also Geldner (1907–1909: I, 63).

²⁴¹ Wackernagel & Debrunner (1930: 554) speak of an indefinite use of *yáthā cid* in this passage, so that they probably do not regard *yáthā* as a proper conjunction or comparative particle either.

parenthetical subclause with a null subject and null copula: ‘Surely you will take notice – however it may be [= in whatever way] – of this common birth of ours, Maruts?’. Nevertheless, this example is syntactically unusual. Hence, Oldenberg (1909–1912: II, 270) does not believe that *yáthā cid* means ‘however’ (‘wie auch immer’) in this passage, but Jamison (comm.X.3: ad loc.) finds his argumentation unconvincing.

The discussion of the previous examples in this section has shown that the clauses that are marked by *yá- cid* are rather diverse. This collocation is found in universal concessive conditional clauses and non-specific free relative clauses, which is not surprising from a typological perspective. What is surprising, however, is that this collocation also occurs in a clause that expresses a concessive relation but does not allow for a universal reading. Others in turn do not express a concessive relation at all. This leads Hettrich (1988: 563f.) to assume that *yá- cid* does not express a universal or free-choice meaning but that it is rather the collocation *yá- cid hí* which expresses a concessive reading. I disagree with him for the following reasons: Unlike Hettrich (1988: 563), I consider ex. (200), which is introduced by *yá cid*, as a fairly clear case of a concessive conditional. Moreover, passages like ex. (209), which contains the sequence *yé cid hí*, speak against Hettrich’s assumption. For if the interpretation by Jamison & Brereton is correct, there is no concessive meaning present at all; if my interpretation, which is in accordance with Hettrich, is correct the concessive reading clearly arises due to the universal reading of *yé cid*. I must admit, however, that my view on *yá- cid (hí)* leaves ex. (205), in which *yé cid (hí)* appears to express a concessive meaning but does not allow for a universal reading, unexplained. Before reassessing the cases in which *yá- cid* clearly does not have a concessive reading, I would like to discuss the collocation *yáthā cid*. Here, Hettrich (1988: 456f.) does not acknowledge a generalizing function of *cid*. He argues that firstly there are cases when subclauses have a generalized reading but *cid* is absent; secondly there are cases in which a generalizing function of *cid* in these positions can be excluded; thirdly, in none of the attested cases is a generalizing function of *cid* necessary.²⁴² All of his observations are correct. In addition, I suggest that Hettrich’s claim can theoretically also be extended to clauses introduced by *yá- cid*. Consider the following examples of passages in which *yáthā* and *yá-* have a free-choice reading without the presence of a following *cid* (Hettrich 1988: 457; Lühr 1997: 57):

(217) <i>imé</i>	<i>radhrám</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>marúto</i>
DEM:NOM.PL.M	feeble:ACC.SG.M	PRT	Marut:NOM.PL.M
<i>junanti</i>	/ <i>bhṛmiṃ</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>yáthā vásavo</i>
spur.on:3PL	whirlwind:ACC.SG.M	PRT	like good:NOM.PL.M

²⁴² Hettrich (1988) does not include the passage in ex. (216) in his discussion, probably due to the unclear syntactic status of *yáthā cid*.

juṣánta

please:AOR.INJ.MID.3PL

‘These Maruts here spur on even the feeble, likewise also the whirlwind,
in whatever way the good ones please.’ RV 7.56.20ab

(218) <i>yajñáir</i>	<i>yá</i>	<i>índre</i>	<i>dádhate</i>
sacrifice:INS.PL.M	REL:NOM.SG.M	Indra:LOC.SG.M	put:SBJV.MID.3SG
<i>dívāmsi</i>	/ <i>kṣáyat</i>	<i>sá</i>	<i>rāyá</i>
reverence:ACC.PL.N	rule:INJ.3SG	DEM:NOM.SG.M	wealth:GEN.SG.M
<i>ṛtapá</i>	<i>ṛtejáh</i>		
protecting.truth:NOM.SG.M	born.in.truth:NOM.SG.M		

‘Whoever with sacrifices will place his friendship in Indra, he will rule over wealth as protector of truth, born in truth.’ RV cd

I will discuss cases where *yáthā cid* does not have a universal/free-choice reading in Section 4.8. Clear cases of this kind involving *yá-* *cid* are exx. (211)–(213) above. The discussion of ex. (215) above has shown that Hettrich’s third argument is also valid, because the interpretation of *yáthā cid* as a concessive conditional is by no means secured. Due to its unclear syntactic interpretation, ex. (216) cannot serve as evidence against Hettrich’s claim either. As a result of the often subtle function and the sometimes fickle syntactic behavior of *cid*, one can also hardly say that *cid* necessarily marks the universal reading even in the clear examples involving *yá-* *cid* that I have given. I cannot certainly exclude the possibility that for instance the clear case of a non-specific free relative clause in ex. (207) is in fact to be treated like ex. (218) and that *cid* has another emphatic function.

I agree with Hettrich (1988: 456f.) that the data are insufficient to certainly establish a universal reading for *yáthā cid*. The only passage where such a reading is the preferred one is ex. (216), where the syntax is unclear. However, I believe that a universal or free-choice reading does exist for *yá-* *cid*. In the majority of cases, such a reading is preferable or at least possible and typological data show that interpreting a relative pronoun followed by an additive particle as a universal concessive conditional or a non-specific free relative clause is plausible. Regarding the first two possible counterarguments, i.e. the existence of universal *yá-* clauses and non-universal *yá-* *cid* clauses, I refer, again, to the comparison with other languages. For there, the same syntactic patterns are observable. For instance, Haspelmath & König (1998: 611) state that in German, universal concessive conditionals are marked by a WH-word and the general additive particle *auch*, which does not occur in an adjacent position (Haspelmath & König 1998: 611). Consider my examples:

(219) a. <i>Mit</i>	<i>WEM</i>	<i>er</i>	<i>auch</i>	<i>geredet</i>	<i>hat,</i>	<i>er</i>	<i>hat</i>	<i>jeden</i>
with	whom	he	ADD	talked	has	he	has	everyone

gehasst.
hated

‘Whoever he talked to, he hated everyone.’

b. *Mit* *wem* *er* ***auch*** *geREdet* *hat,* *war* *Peters*
with whom he ADD talked has was Peter’s

Bruder.
brother

‘Someone that he also talked to (and did not only see) was Peter’s brother.’

The subclause in a. is a concessive conditional clause. In contrast, the sentence in the b. is a pseudo-cleft construction, the subclause of which happens to be syntactically identical to the one in a. The two sentences do differ prosodically but whether such a difference between the Vedic exx. (200) and (211)–(213) also exists has to remain unanswered. Likewise, a universal concessive conditional can also be expressed only with a WH-word and without an additive particle in German:

(220) *Wie* *man* *es* *macht,* *es* *ist* *falsch!*
how one it does it is wrong

‘However you do it, it’s wrong!’

This sentence is an approximate equivalent to the one containing the additive particle *Wie man es auch macht, es ist falsch!*.²⁴³ Thus, if with Haspelmath & König (1998: 611) one regards *auch* as a marker of universal concessive conditionals in German, *cid* can also be assigned the function of marking universal concessive conditionals in Vedic. The same holds true for non-specific free relative clauses.

Now that I have distinguished those cases in which *yá- cid* expresses a universal concessive conditional from those cases in which it does not, or have at least discussed the possible interpretations, I will go on to discuss two more points concerning the concessive conditionals. Firstly, I would like to recapitulate the use of particles in the main clause to enhance the concessive relation between the two clauses. I have pointed to the fact that in exx. (204), (205), (208) and (215) the main clause contains a particle. These particles all occur in Wackernagel position. In exx. (204) and (208), this particle is *cid*; in ex. (205) it is *sú* and in ex. (215) it is *íd*. I have argued that if these are in fact universal concessive conditionals, the particles have the effect of enhancing the concessive relation between main and subclause. In ex. (204), the totalizing *cid* emphasizes the irrelevance of the identity of the truth-serving ancients; due to semantic problems in the interpretation of ex. (208), the exact function of *cid* and its effect on the concessive relation is harder to determine. In ex. (205), the presence of the

²⁴³ Both variants are also possible as non-specific free relative clauses: *Wie man es (auch) macht, ist es falsch!*.

hortative *sú* emphasizes the importance of the request and therefore renders what is said in the subclause as irrelevant (cf. also Ludwig 1876–1888: V, 598). Similarly, the exclusive function of *íd* also contributes to expressing the irrelevance of the way the heart of the addressee conceives in ex. (215), given that this is really a concessive conditional. I would like to stress again that even though these particles have the effect of enhancing the concessive relation between sub- and main clause in these passages, they do not lose their original function in doing so. On the contrary, in each of the examples, it is this very function which is exploited to enhance the concessive meaning.

The second point I would like to discuss before moving on to the other types of concessive conditionals is the types of linking with which the universal concessive conditionals are attested. In ex. (209), the predicate of the main clause *gr̥n̥thi* ‘greet’ is in the imperative mood. This suggests the clauses are linked at the illocutionary level, because linking at the content level is not present with imperative speech acts unless the other clause is within the scope of the imperative (Sweetser 1990: 155). I assume that the poet wants to express that he makes his request regardless of the requests of previous seers. Notice, however, that the interpretation of this example is further complicated because Jamison & Brereton (2014: 161) do not interpret this passage as an instance of a universal conditional. However, as I have said, I follow Hettrich’s suggestion of a universal interpretation. Further cases of this kind are probably RV 1.185.8 and possibly ex. (205), even though there, *yé cid* does not introduce a universal concessive conditional. Another similar case is possibly ex. (201), whose main clause predicate is in the optative mood and expresses a wish. If ex. (214) is to be interpreted as a universal concessive conditional, with an optative predicate in the main clause, the linking is also probably at the illocutionary level. In ex. (202), which is not certainly a universal concessive conditional, I tend towards an analysis as linking at the content level. The level of linking in ex. (210) is fairly difficult to determine, which is mainly due to the syntactic and interpretational problems that I have discussed. If I am correct in assuming that this stanza is intended as a reminder that nobody else possesses the full strength of Indra, the linking can be considered to be also on the illocutionary level.

Ex. (204) has received analyses which do not consider it as a concessive conditional. However, if one follows Sieg (1902: 123) and Hettrich (1988: 561f.), who consider an interpretation of *cid* as generalizing possible, the two clauses are linked at the content level: The actual identities and properties of the forefathers are irrelevant for the fact that they got out of harness. As I have discussed, the interpretation of ex. (208), which is possibly a universal concessive conditional is rather unclear.

4.6.2.2 Scalar concessive conditionals

In addition to universal concessive conditionals, which I discussed in the previous section, Lühr (1997: 61–63) also finds *cid* involved in the formation of concessive conditionals of the type ‘even if’ (‘auch wenn’).²⁴⁴ One example she gives is the following stanza from a hymn dedicated to Agni:

(221) <i>yác</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>śásvatā</i>	<i>tánā</i>	/	
if	PRT	for	perpetual:INS.SG.F	succession:INS.SG.F		
<i>devám-devam</i>			<i>yájāmahe</i>	/	<i>tuvé</i>	<i>íd</i>
god:ACC.SG.M-god:ACC.SG.M			sacrifice:MID.1PL		2SG.LOC	PRT
<i>dhūyate</i>		<i>havíh</i>				
pour:PASS.3SG		oblation:NOM.SG.N				

‘For **even when** we sacrifice to god after god in unbroken succession, it is just in you that the oblation is poured.’ RV 1.26.6

Interestingly, such scalar concessive conditionals always contain the collocation *yád cid hí*. The Rigveda contains 11 clauses which contain the collocation *yád cid hí*; apart from these, there are no other clauses containing the collocation *yád cid* (Hettrich 1988: 328–330; 332). As a result, Hettrich (1988: 332–334) regards *yád cid hí* as an analytic expression that has the function of a concessive conjunction. This analysis is corroborated by the fact that there are clear cases in which clauses introduced by *yád cid hí* clearly have a factual reading, which Bakker (1988) regards as a typical property of concessives. Consider the following example:

(222) <i>yác</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>śásvatām</i>	<i>ási</i>	/	<i>índra</i>
if	PRT	for	perpetual:GEN.PL.M	be:2SG		Indra:VOC.SG.M
<i>śádhāraṇas</i>			<i>tuvám</i>	/	<i>tám</i>	<i>tvā</i>
common.support:NOM.SG.M			2SG.NOM		DEM:ACC.SG.M	2SG.ACC
<i>vayám</i>		<i>havāmahe</i>				
1PL.NOM		call:MID.1PL				

‘**Even though** you are the support common to each and every one, Indra, we summon you to us.’ RV 4.32.13=8.65.7

Here, both the proposition that Indra is common to everyone and the proposition that at the time of the utterance Indra is summoned by the speaker and his associates are facts (cf. Hettrich 1988: 331). This is also reflected in the translations of *yád cid hí* in this passage. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 608) translate it as ‘even though’, Witzel et al. (2013: 171) translate it as ‘wenn ... auch’ and Geldner (1951–1957: I, 461) translates it as ‘ob ... zwar’, all of which are concessive conjunctions in English or German (cf. König & Eisenberg 1984: 323).²⁴⁵ Thus, for

²⁴⁴ Notice that like German *wenn* the Vedic conjunction *yád* can be translated as ‘if’ or ‘when’.

²⁴⁵ Contrary to these interpretations, Ludwig (1876–1888: II, 107), Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 140) and Griffith (1896–1897: I, 436) assume a causal relation between the two clauses: ‘da du, o Indra, eben aller gemeinsam eigentum, | darum rufen wir dich’ (Ludwig); ‘Weil du Gemeingut aller bist, sie alle stützend immerdar, So rufen

instance, Jamison & Brereton (2014) translate 5 instances of this collocation as ‘even though’ or ‘for even though’. Nevertheless, Lühr (1997: 62f.) disagrees with Hettrich’s analysis.²⁴⁶ She argues that in the collocation *yád cid hí, hí* is interpretable in its usual connective sense ‘for’ and thus does not contribute to the concessive meaning. This is in accordance with the findings of Bakker (1988: 209–212) regarding scalar concessive conditionals in Homeric Greek which are formed by the conjunction $\epsilon\iota$ and the scalar additive particle $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$. He explains that when this collocation is followed by the connector $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ ‘for’, the latter particle retains its function and expresses that the concessive conditional construction as a whole is to be understood as an explanation vel sim. of what was said before. However, the Rigvedic data differ from Bakker’s findings in that there are two instances (RV 1.25.1 and 1.29.1) in which *yád cid hí* occurs in the first pāda of the hymn and therefore cannot refer to previous discourse. However, Lühr (1997: 62) explains that a particle like ‘for’ can also refer to a non-expressed context that has to be inferred by the hearer. Moreover, she observes the co-occurrence of *yád cid (hí)* with universally quantifying expressions (cf. *devám-devam* ‘god after god’ in ex. (221)), which are themselves typical of concessive conditionals.²⁴⁷ Even in a passage like ex. (222) with clear characteristics of a proper concessive, the presence of the universal quantifier *śáśvatām* in her opinion hints towards an interpretation of a concessive conditional. In addition, following Haspelmath & König (1998: 576), one can assume that the concessive reading arises from the fact that the hearer is already aware of the fact that Indra is common to everyone, so that an analysis as concessive conditional is adequate. Viti (2007: 186–188) reassesses the views by Hettrich and Lühr. She concludes that “[i]t is appropriate to interpret factual *yác cid dhí*-clauses in the light of *cid*, [...] rather than of the manifold strategies of C[oncessive]C[onditional]C[ause]s”. This means that on the one hand, she rejects Hettrich’s analysis of an analytic construction, but on the other hand, she analyzes factual cases of *yád cid hí* clauses differently than non-factual ones (see also Viti 2008a: 395–397). The uncertainty with respect to the interpretation of clauses introduced by *yád cid hí* shows that the observation made by König (1988: 152), namely that concessives and concessive conditionals are regularly marked by the same formal means appears to be true for Vedic Sanskrit as well. As a case that has even more characteristics of a proper concessive than ex. (222), Lühr (1997: 74) gives the following example:

wir, o Indra, dich’ (Grassmann); ‘For, Indra, verily thou art the general treasure even of all. Thee, therefore, do we invoke’ (Griffith). However, due to the position of *cid*, I consider a concessive relation more plausible.

²⁴⁶ See also Renou (1952: 377), Viti (2007: 181f.).

²⁴⁷ This also explains why Grassmann (1873: 455) subsumes these cases under the generalizing *yad cid*, which Hettrich (1988: 330) considers wrong.

(223) <i>yác</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>vām</i>	<i>purá</i>	<i>ṛṣayo</i>	/	<i>juhūrē</i>
if	PRT	for	2DU.ACC	before	seer:NOM.PL.M		call:PERF.MID.3PL
<i>ávase</i>		<i>narā</i>	/	<i>á</i>	<i>yātam</i>		<i>aśvinā</i>
help:DAT.SG.N		man:VOC.DU.M		LP	go:IMP.2DU		Aśvin:VOC.DU.M+LP
<i>gatam</i>							
go:AOR.IMP.2DU							

‘**Although/even if** seers previously called upon you for help, o men, drive here, o Aśvins, come here!’²⁴⁸ RV 8.8.6a–c

Lühr regards this as a genuine concessive structure.²⁴⁹ She explains that the subclause is clearly factual and does not express a possibility, but the conjunction may nevertheless be translated by ‘even if’ (‘auch wenn’). Thus, as for the status of clauses introduced by *yád cid* as concessives or concessive conditionals, I endorse the following analysis: The criterion adduced by König & Eisenberg (1984: 322f.), i.e. that concessive conjunctions have to enforce a concessive reading, is difficult to apply due to the lack of native speaker’s intuition. At least, *yád cid* occurs mainly in concessive contexts, but in ex. (208) in Section 4.6.2.1 it is unclear whether there is a concessive relation between the two clauses. Given the fact that *yád cid* clauses can express both factual and non-factual clauses and that it is typical for concessive conditionals to be able to express both types (Haspelmath & König 1998: 576), *yád cid* is best characterized as a marker of concessive conditionals rather than of proper concessive clauses. In light of this analysis, I agree with Oertel (1941: 71), according to whom Vedic is void of concessive conjunctions. This analysis is furthermore in accordance with Lühr (1997: 76), who concludes that early Vedic lacks the grammatical category of concessivity because of the very fact that concessive constructions as in ex. (223) are expressed by the same linguistic means as scalar concessive conditionals.

Having discussed the grammatical status of *yád cid (hí)* clauses, I will now move on to investigate further characteristics regarding these clauses. In all 11 text passages, the subclause introduced by *yád cid (hí)* precedes the main clause, which according to Bakker (1988: 210) is also the typical order in Homeric Greek. He (1988: 211) also finds that the adversative particle *ἀλλά* regularly occurs in the main clause of scalar concessive conditionals. In the Rigveda, there is one instance in which the particle *tú (tú)*, one of whose functions is adversative (Grassmann 1873: 538), occurs in the second position of the main clause:

²⁴⁸ The translation deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

²⁴⁹ “[W]ährend also die verschiedenen Typen von Irrelevanzkonditionalia ein vielfältiges Bild abgeben, finden sich in den als echt konzessiv auffaßbaren Strukturen nur *cid* und *yác cid dhí*, und zwar in der Funktion von ‘auch wenn’” (Lühr 1997: 75). On single *cid* see my discussion of exx. (229)–(231) and Section 4.6.3.

(224) <i>yác</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>satya</i>		<i>somapā</i>		/	
if	PRT	for	true:VOC.SG.M		soma.drinker:VOC.SG.M			
<i>anāśastā</i>			<i>iva</i>	<i>smási</i>	/	<i>ā</i>	<i>tú</i>	<i>na</i>
without.hope:NOM.PL.M			like	be:1PL		LP	PRT	1PL.ACC
<i>indra</i>			<i>śamsaya</i>		/	<i>góṣu</i>		<i>ásveṣu</i>
Indra:VOC.SG.M			recite:CAUS.IMP.2SG			cow:LOC.PL.F		horse:LOC.PL.M
<i>śubhríṣu</i>		/	<i>sahásreṣu</i>			<i>tuvīmagha</i>		
resplendent:LOC.PL.M			thousand:LOC.PL.M			generous:VOC.SG.M		

‘**Even when** we are devoid of hope, as it were, o you true drinker of soma, give us hope for resplendent cows and horses in the thousands, o powerfully generous Indra.’ RV 1.29.1

In his investigation of Rigvedic *tú*, Klein (1982: 1–11) observes that after imperatives the particle does not have an adversative but a hortative value and that in the Rigveda its adversative value is attested rather scantily. As a result, I assume that in this example it does not have an adversative value either (cf. Viti 2008a: 397). Similarly to *tú*, Klein (1982: 12–26) assigns a hortative function to *sú* after imperatives, which is also present in ex. (205) above. This use can also be found in the following concessive conditional:

(225) <i>yác</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>puruṣatrā</i>	<i>yaviṣṭha</i>		/
if	PRT	for	2SG.DAT	humanly	youngest:VOC.SG.M		
<i>ácittibhiś</i>	<i>cakṛmā</i>	<i>kác</i>		<i>cid</i>	<i>āgaḥ</i>		/
folly:INS.PL.F	do:PERF.1PL	what:ACC.SG.N		PRT	sin:ACC.SG.N		
<i>kṛdhí</i>		<i>śú</i>	<i>asmāñ</i>	<i>áditer</i>		<i>ánāgān</i>	
do:AOR.IMP.2SG		PRT	1PL.ACC	unbinding:GEN.SG.F		innocent:ACC.PL.M	

‘For **even if** we have committed any sin against you through folly as it is typical for humans, o youngest one, make us without offense through unbinding [Aditi],’²⁵⁰

‘**Whatever** sin, O youngest (god), we have committed against thee in thoughtlessness, men as we are, ...’ (Oldenberg 1897: 354) RV 4.12.4a–c

In exx. (224) and (225), the particles *tú* and *sú*, respectively, signals the importance of the request and thereby renders the concessive conditional clause all the more irrelevant. In a similar vein, Lühr (2009: 181f.) assumes with respect to ex. (224) that the stressed particle cancels the contradiction between the presupposition of the concessive conditional and the main clause. Notice that in this example it is theoretically also possible to interpret *yád* as the ACC.SG.N of the relative pronoun. However, in the discussion of ex. (202) in Section 4.6.2.1 I argued against this interpretation.

²⁵⁰ The translation of pādas a/b follows Geldner (1951–1957: I, 432); Pāda c is adopted from Jamison & Brereton (2014: 575).

Ex. (221) above exhibits the exclusive particle *íd* (cf. Section 5.1) in the second position of the main clause, which enhances the irrelevance of the conditional clause in that it excludes all other gods, which are the object of the subclause (cf. also Hettrich 1988: 331). The particle *íd* also occurs in the following example, but this time after the predicate noun of an imperative:

(226) <i>yác</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>ápi</i>	<i>vyáthir</i>	/
if	PRT	for	2SG.DAT	LP	wayward.course:ACC.SG.N	
<i>jaganvámso</i>				<i>ámanmahi</i>	/	<i>godá</i> <i>íd</i>
go:PTCP.PERF.ACT.NOM.PL.M				think:MID.1PL		cow.giver:NOM.SG.M PRT
<i>indra</i>			<i>bodhi</i>		<i>naḥ</i>	
indra:VOC.SG.M			become:AOR.IMP.2SG		1PL.DAT	

‘For **even though** we’ve thought that we’ve been going a wayward course to you, still become for us a giver of cows, Indra.’ RV 8.45.19

As I will argue in Section 5.7, *íd* after predicate nouns with an imperative copula has the same adhortative function as after imperatives and I assume the same function to be present here. This means that *íd* does not have a special function when it appears in the main clause of a concessive conditional, but it can nevertheless secondarily have the function of enhancing the concessive meaning. As a result, exx. (221) and (224)–(226) show that particles in the main clause of a scalar concessive conditional may serve to enhance the concessive relation between the two clauses. However, as with universal concessive conditionals, they do not lose their original function in doing so but they create this effect by means of their original function in the first place.

With respect to the levels of linking, *yád cid hí* is attested for linking at the content level and at the illocutionary level. In 6 instances, the predicate of the main clause is in the imperative mood and in one instance the main clause contains a negative request expressed by the prohibitive particle *má* and the injunctive mood. Consider the following examples:

(227) <i>yác</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>tvā</i>	<i>jánā</i>	<i>imé</i>	/
if	PRT	for	2SG.ACC	people:NOM.PL.M	DEM:NOM.PL.M	
<i>nānā</i>		<i>hávanta</i>		<i>ūtāye</i>	/	<i>asmākam</i>
separately		call:INJ.MID.3PL		help:DAT.SG.F		1PL.GEN
<i>bráhma</i>		<i>idám</i>		<i>indra</i>	<i>bhūtu</i>	
formulation:NOM.SG.N		DEM:NOM.SG.N		Indra:VOC.SG.M	become:AOR.IMP.3SG	
<i>te</i>	/	<i>áhā</i>	<i>vísvā</i>	<i>ca</i>	<i>várdhanam</i>	
2SG.GEN		day:ACC.PL.N	all:ACC.PL.N	and	strengthening:NOM.SG.N	

‘For **even though** these peoples now, every man for himself, call upon you for help, let it be our sacred formulation, Indra, that becomes your strengthening now and throughout all days.’ RV 8.1.3

(228) <i>yác</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>víšo</i>	<i>yathā</i>	/	<i>prá</i>
if	PRT	for	2SG.GEN	clan:NOM.PL.F	like		LP

<i>deva</i>	<i>varuṇa</i>	<i>vratám</i>	/ <i>minīmási</i>	
god:VOC.SG.M	Varuṇa:VOC.SG.M	commandment:ACC.SG.N	diminish:1PL	
<i>dyávi-dyavi</i>	//	<i>mā</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>vadhāya</i>
day:LOC.SG.M-day:LOC.SG.M		NEG	1PL.ACC	weapon:DAT.SG.M
<i>hatnáve</i>	/	<i>jihīlānāsya</i>	<i>rīradhaḥ</i>	
deadly:DAT.SG.M		be.angry:PTCP.PERF.MID.GEN.SG.M	subject:AOR.INJ.2SG	

‘1. **Even if** every day we confound your commandment, o god Varuṇa, as clans (do their king’s commandment),

2. Do not subject us to your deadly weapon when you are enraged’ RV 1.25.1–2b

As in ex. (209) of Section 4.6.2.1, I surmise that the subclauses are outside the scope of the imperative/prohibitive force, so that I regard these two passage as cases of linking at the illocutionary level.²⁵¹ In ex. (228) it may seem plausible to regard the subclause as being inside the scope of the main clause’s prohibitive force, but notice that the two clauses are in different stanzas. This points at a rather loose connection between the clauses. The other cases with imperatives in the main clause are exx. (223)–(226) and RV 1.28.5. In exx. (223) and (226), I tend towards linking at the illocutionary level whereas in ex. (224), and possibly (225), I assume linking at the content level. In the 3 cases, the predicate of the main clause is in the indicative mood. Consider again ex. (221). There, the poet refers to the fact that during every sacrifice oblations are poured into the fire (*ágni-*). As a result, in any case Agni receives the oblations despite the fact that the sacrifice may be dedicated to another god, so that the two clauses are linked on the content level. The main clause of ex. (222), which is repeated in RV 8.65.7, also contains a predicate in the indicative mood. However, *pāda c* ‘we summon you to us’ is not a mere description of the fact that Indra is summoned. Rather, it is meant as a request for Indra to hear the call and the poet wants to make clear that he considers all other people irrelevant. Hence, the link is on the illocutionary level.

In the examples discussed thus far, *cid* is combined with a conjunction or relative pronoun to express a concessive relation. This is in accordance with König (2017: 40), who states that “concessivity is never expressed by an additive marker alone, and [that it] requires the compositional effect of a scalar marker and a conditional adverbial”. Contrary to this claim, Lühr (1997: 63) also finds text passages in which *cid* assigns concessive conditional meaning to finite clauses without the presence of a preceding subordinating conjunction. One example that she gives is the following passage dedicated to Indra:²⁵²

(229) <i>viśve</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>tvā</i>	<i>vihāvanta</i>	<i>mártā</i>	/
all:NOM.PL.M	PRT	for	2SG.ACC	LP.call:INJ.MID.3PL	mortal:NOM.PL.M	

²⁵¹ On the forms of the main clause predicates that occur with *yád cid hí* clauses see Hettrich (1988: 333).

²⁵² The accent on the finite verb *vihāvanta* ‘they vie in invoking’ is caused by *hí*.

<i>asmākam</i>	<i>íc</i>	<i>chṛṇuhi</i>	<i>viśvaminva</i>
1PL.GEN	PRT	hear:IMP.2SG	all.impelling:VOC.SG.M

‘for **although** all mortals vie in invoking you, listen only to us, o all-impeller.’ RV 7.28.1cd

Similar to ex. (221), the irrelevance of the clause in pāda c is enhanced by the presence of the exclusive particle *íd* in pāda d as well as the emphatic pronoun *asmākam* ‘our’ (cf. Section 5.1, cf. also Grassmann 1873: 455; Ludwig 1876–1888: V, 127f.; Hettrich 1988: 333): All other humans do not matter, only we are important. The assumption that pāda c constitutes a concessive clause is in accordance with the translations by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 917) given in ex. (229) and with Griffith (1896–1897: II, 28), who translates pāda c as ‘Though mortal men on every side invoke thee’. Similarly, the Geldner (1951–1957: II, 206) begins his translation with the concessive particle ‘zwar’.²⁵³ Plausible as the concessive interpretation may seem, König’s claim raises the question of whether Lühr is correct in assuming that *cid* is used in order to mark the clause in c as a scalar concessive conditional here. Hettrich (1988: 176) observes a concessive relation between the *hí*-clause and the main clause, but he does not regard *cid* as a concessivity marker here. Rather, he (1988: 332f.) assumes that unlike in *yád cid hí*, which he analyzes as an analytic conjunction, *cid* and *hí* retain their own function and *cid* emphasizes the preceding word. As Lühr (1997: 63) notes, Hoffmann (1967: 128) does not translate pāda c as a concessive conditional clause either.²⁵⁴ The next question is then what the exact nature of the emphasis that *cid* expresses might be. At least, the context does not suggest that *cid* is used as an additive particle here, because apart from the mortals there is no additional group of entities that vie in invoking Indra. It might be possible that *cid* has narrow focus with respect to *viśve* ‘all’, expressing that not only many but even all humans invoke Agni, but that does not seem intuitive, either. In Section 4.4.1, where I briefly discussed this text passage, I argued that after certain expressions *cid* has a totalizing function and I assume that this function is present after universal quantifiers like *viśva-* ‘all’. As a result, this seems to be the most plausible interpretation.

Lühr (1997: 63) gives two additional text passages in which she assumes *cid* to mark a scalar concessive conditional clause without the presence of a conjunction. In both passages, *cid* is followed by *hí*:

(230) <i>purutrā</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>vām</i>	<i>narā</i>	/	<i>vihváyante</i>
in.many.places	PRT	for	2DU.ACC	man:VOC.DU.M		LP.call:MID.3PL

²⁵³ ‘Zwar rufen dich alle Sterblichen um die Wette. Erhöre unseren Ruf, du Allbeweger!’.

²⁵⁴ ‘Alle Sterblichen rufen dich ja an’.

manīṣīṇaḥ / *vāghádbhir* *aśvinā́* *gatam*
 wise:NOM.PL.M cantor:INS.PL.M Aśvin:VOC.DU.M+LP go:AOR.IMP.2DU

‘**Even though** in many places men of inspired thought vie with (other) cantors in invoking you two—o men, o Aśvins, come here.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1035)

‘In **very** many places, men of inspired thought ...’ (my adaptation) RV 8.5.16

(231) *pūrvīś* *cid* *dhí* *tvé* *tuvikūrmin* *āśáso* /
 many:NOM.PL.F PRT for 2SG.LOC powerful:VOC.SG.M hope:NOM.PL.F
hávanta *indra* *ūtáyaḥ* / *tiráś* *cid*
 call:MID.3SG Indra:VOC.SG.M help:NOM.PL.F LP PRT
aryáḥ *sávanā́* *vaso*
 stranger:GEN.SG.M pressing:ACC.PL.N+LP good:VOC.SG.M
gahi
 go:AOR.IMP.2SG

‘For **although** many are the hopes that call to you, powerfully ranging Indra, and many are your forms of help, pass over the pressings of the stranger, good one.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1155)

‘For **very** many are the hopes that call to you, powerfully ranging Indra, and very many are your forms of help. Go PAST the pressings of the stranger, good one.’ (my adaptation) RV 8.66.12a–c

Hettrich (1988: 176; 333) analyzes both cases like ex. (206), i.e. he does not regard *cid* primarily as a marker of concessivity. However, as the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1035; 1155) shows, a concessive interpretation of the clause whose second position *cid* occupies is appealing. This is also reflected in other translations. Thus, in the first example Geldner (1951–1957: II, 292) introduces the clause with the concessive conjunction ‘obgleich’ and Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 396) uses the concessive particle ‘zwar’.²⁵⁵ There are, however, other interpretations. Griffith (1896–1897: II, 117) appears to interpret *cid* as an emphasizer (cf. Section 5.7), for he translates ‘Verily sages call on you, ye Heroes, in full many a place. Moved by the priests, O Aśvins, come’. Ludwig (1876–1888: I, 67) does not render *cid*.²⁵⁶ In the second example, it is Geldner (1951–1957: II, 389) who uses ‘zwar’, whereas Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 482) leaves *cid* untranslated.²⁵⁷

It is conspicuous that in all three cases in which Lühr (1997: 63) assumes *cid* to mark a concessive conditional clause the particle occurs after a quantifier. In ex. (229) after *vísva-* ‘all’;

²⁵⁵ ‘Obgleich sich vielerorts um euch, ihr Herren, die (Lieder)sinnenden mit (anderen) Sängern streiten, o Aśvin, so kommt (zu uns)!’ (Geldner); ‘An vielen Orten rufen euch, o Helden, zwar die Weisen an, Von uns verehrt, o Ritter, kommt’ (Grassmann).

²⁵⁶ ‘an vilen orten rufen euch, o helden, die weisen auf; | vermöge der priester, Aśvinâ komt’.

²⁵⁷ ‘Zwar werden viele Hoffnungen auf dich (gesetzt), du Tatenreicher, und werden deine Hilfen (von vielen) angerufen, Indra. Komm her, du Guter, sogar an eines hohen Herren Trankopfern vorüber!’ (Geldner); ‘Vielwirkender, dir streben viele Wünsche zu, dich, Indra, ladend zum Genuss; Auch durch des Feindes Spenden dring’, o guter, her’ (Grassmann)

in ex. (231) after *purú-* ‘much/many’ and in ex. (230) after *purutrā́* ‘in many places’, an adverb derived from *purú-*. I have just argued for a totalizing function of *cid* after the universal quantifier in ex. (229). In addition, I argued in Section 4.5 that *cid* has the ability to function as a degree modifier marking a high degree. I assume that *cid* has exactly this function in the two preceding text passages and that *purú-* may be rendered here as ‘very many’ vel sim. in these cases. This means that *cid* does not function as a marker of concessivity here but that it nevertheless serves to enhance the concessive relation of the two clauses. Thus, for ex. (230) one can say that the greater the number of places is where men vie in invoking the Aśvins, the less likely is it that they come here. If my analysis is correct, exx. (229)–(231), albeit containing clauses that are in a concessive relation, are no instances of grammaticalized concessive or concessive conditional clauses.

4.6.2.3 Alternative concessive conditionals

In addition to scalar and universal concessive conditionals, Lühr (1997: 59–61) also discusses the third type, alternative concessive conditionals. However, she does not discuss any examples that involve *cid*. As one example of this type, she gives the following text passage:

(232) <i>yád</i>	<i>antárikṣe</i>	<i>pátathaḥ</i>	<i>purubhujā</i>	/
if	mid-space:LOC.SG.N	fly:2DU	with.many.benefits:VOC.DU.M	
<i>yád</i>	<i>vemé [=vā imé]</i>	<i>ródasī</i>	<i>ánu</i>	/ <i>yád</i>
if	or+DEM:ACC.DU.F	world.halves:ACC.DU.F	LP	if
<i>vā</i>	<i>svadhābhir</i>	<i>adhitiṣṭhatho</i>	<i>rátham</i>	/ <i>áta</i>
or	own.power:INS.PL.F	LP.stand:2.DU	chariot:ACC.SG.M	from.there
<i>ā́</i>	<i>yātam</i>	<i>aśvinā</i>		
LP	go:IMP.2DU	Aśvin:VOC.DU.M		

‘If you are flying in the midspace or if along these two world-halves, o you who provide many benefits, or if, after your wont, you are standing upon your chariot, from there drive here, o Aśvins.’ RV 8.10.6

In this example, the disjunction of the three parallel subordinate clauses in the pādas a–c is made explicit by the enclitic *vā* ‘or’ in pāda c. According to my data, there is the possibility that *cid* may be used to express such a disjunction as well. Consider ex. (233), where the double use of *cid* probably expresses a free-choice disjunction:

(233) <i>táva</i>	<i>svādiṣṭhā</i>	/ <i>agne</i>	<i>sámdrṣtir</i>	/
2SG.GEN	sweetest:NOM.SG.F	Agni:VOC.SG.M	complete.sight:NOM.SG.F	
<i>idā́</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>áhna</i>	/ <i>idā́</i>	<i>cid</i>
now	PRT	day:GEN.SG.N	now	PRT
			<i>aktóḥ</i>	
			night:GEN.SG.M	

‘Let Agni be sharp-witted, **though** of tender age’ RV 7.4.2a

A comparison of these two examples show that *ní miṣántā* in ex. (234) and *táruṇas* in ex. (235) fulfill the same syntactic function although the former form is morphologically a participle and the latter form is not. As a result, it is imprecise to state that the behavior which Lühr observes for *cid* in cases like ex. (234) is typical for participle constructions. Rather the common property of the two examples is that they involve secondary predication.

A detailed description of secondary predicates from a cross-linguistic perspective is provided by Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann (2004) and Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt (2005a). Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt (2005b: 3–27) distinguish between secondary predicates and other related types of adjuncts. These adjunct types “share the characteristics of allowing participant-oriented readings and of denoting a state or condition which temporally overlaps with the state of affairs designated by the main predicate” (Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt 2005b: 25). Among the class of secondary predicates, they distinguish two major subgroups, viz. depictive secondary predicates (or depictives proper) on the one hand and circumstantial secondary predicates (or circumstantials) on the other hand. According to their classification, proper depictives denote a state of a participant that is not expressed by the main predicate and they are focus exponents (ex. (236)), whereas circumstantials are outside the focus domain (ex. (237)). Similar to circumstantials are free strong adjuncts. However, free strong adjuncts contain a separate proposition and are outside the clause of the main predicate (ex. (238)). A further type they distinguish are general adjunct constructions, which are ambiguous with respect to event and participant orientation. Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt (2005a: 8; 16; 20) illustrate proper depictives, circumstantials and free strong adjuncts by means of the following English examples:

(236) *John left the party **angry**.*

(237) *I can’t work **hungry**.*

(238) ***Having unusually long arms**, John can touch the ceiling.*

In my investigation, circumstantials will be of special importance. For Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt (2005a: 17) explain that “[i]n the case of circumstantials, other semantic links are evoked in addition to the basic pure temporal overlap”, which are not found with depictives proper. Among these, Nichols (1978: 117) mentions concessives as one subgroup besides temporal and conditional circumstantials. As an example of concessive circumstantials, she (1978: 115) gives the following English sentence:

(239) ***Even dead** I won’t forget.²⁵⁹*

²⁵⁹ I have altered spelling and punctuation.

This example, as well as the Vedic examples discussed thus far, suggest that *cid* can be employed to mark concessive circumstantials. Before addressing this question, it is first important to discuss Vedic secondary predicates in general. Casaretto & Reinöhl (submitted) and Casaretto (2020) investigate the properties of secondary predicates in Vedic Sanskrit. One of the main questions of Casaretto & Reinöhl (submitted) is how secondary predicates can be distinguished from other syntactic functions, like attributes and appositions. The major problem regarding this question is that secondary predicates in Vedic are not morphologically distinguished from other syntactic functions.

Also among secondary predicates, Casaretto & Reinöhl (submitted) find it difficult to distinguish between depictives proper and circumstantials. As one difference between those two types of secondary predicates, Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt (2005a: 18) mention, among others, that depictives proper are within the scope of clause negation whereas circumstantials are not. They illustrate this by means of the following example of a circumstantial in a negated clause:

(240) a. *This tea isn't GOOD cold.*

b. ?? *This tea isn't good COLD.*

They explain that a sentence like a. in ex. (240), where the circumstantial *cold* is in the scope of the negation, is odd whereas a sentence like *She didn't die young*, where the depictive *young* is within the scope of negation, is perfectly fine. Casaretto & Reinöhl (submitted) are able to apply this criterion to Vedic texts as well. However, they find only one example in their corpus, which comprises prose texts as well as parts of the first and second book of the Rigveda, namely the following passage from the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa:²⁶⁰

(241) <i>tám</i>	<i>tú</i>	<i>tvā</i>	<i>mā</i>	<i>giráu</i>
DEM:ACC.SG.M	PRT	2SG.ACC	NEG	mountain:LOC.SG.M
<i>sántam</i>	<i>udakám</i>	<i>antáschaitṣīt</i>		
be:PTCP.PRS.ACC.SG.M	water:NOM.SG.N	cut.off:AOR.INJ.3SG		

‘The water shall not cut you off while (you are) being on the mountain.’ (ŚB 1,8,1,6)

Here, the secondary predicate is not within the scope of the negation. The particle *mā* negates only the proposition that the water will not affect the addressee but not the circumstance that he is on the mountain.

Let us now return to the examination of *cid* in exx. (234) and (235). Firstly, there is a temporal overlap between the main predicate and the nominals *ní miṣántā* and *táruṇas*, respectively. The blinking occurs at the same time as the being attentive and Agni is of tender

²⁶⁰ Casaretto (2020) adduces a further example.

age at the same time that is to be sharp-witted. Moreover, blinking and being of tender age are not permanent properties of the controllers. As a result, *ní miṣántā* and *táruṇas* are not attributes but secondary predicates. Secondly, the presence of *cid* overtly establishes a semantic relationship which exceeds mere temporal overlap, namely that of concession. This allows for the conclusion that *ní miṣántā* and *táruṇas* are circumstantials.

Since *cid* serves to overtly mark this concessive relation, it is tempting to assume that all secondary predicates that occur with *cid* are circumstantials. As I have outlined above there are formal and semantic criteria to distinguish depictives from circumstantials, so that my hypothesis has to be tested against these criteria. The only available formal criterion to validate this hypothesis is the negation test that Casaretto & Reinöhl (submitted) apply to delimit circumstantials from depictives: If there is a Rigvedic text passage in which a secondary predicate marked by *cid* occurs within the scope of clausemate negation, this secondary predicate is a depictive and the hypothesis is false. Throughout the Rigveda, I have identified only one clear example in which a secondary predicate with *cid* occurs in a negated clause. This example is the following text passage from a hymn dedicated to Agni:

(242) <i>ánti</i>	<i>cit</i>	<i>sántam</i>	<i>áha</i>	/	<i>yajñám</i>
nearby	PRT	be:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.SG.M	PRT		sacrifice:ACC.SG.M
<i>mártasya</i>		<i>ripóḥ</i>	/	<i>nópa</i> [= <i>ná upa</i>]	
mortal:GEN.SG.M		treacherous:GEN.SG.M		NEG+LP	
<i>veṣi</i>		<i>jātavedaḥ</i>			
seek.out:2SG		Jātavedas:VOC.SG.M			

‘The sacrifice of the cheating mortal, **even though** it be nearby—you do not seek it out, o Jātavedas.’ RV 8.11.4²⁶¹

In this sentence, *ánti sántam* ‘being nearby’ is probably not an attribute of *yajñam* ‘sacrifice’, because it does not denote a general property.²⁶² Rather, there is a temporal overlap between Agni not seeking out the sacrifice of a cheating mortal and that sacrifice being near, which is characteristic of a secondary predicate. In this example, the secondary predicate is not within the scope of the negation. The particle *ná* only negates the proposition that Agni seeks out the sacrifice of the cheating mortal and not the circumstance that it is nearby. As a result, the one clear case of a secondary predicate with a concessive meaning expressed by *cid* in a negated clause that I find in the Rigveda is a circumstantial.

²⁶¹ I have added the translation of the vocative ‘o Jātavedas’, which Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1050) have mistakenly omitted in their translation (Jamison comm.VIII.1: ad loc.).

²⁶² Note that according to Lowe (2015: 178f.) the present participle *sánt-* ‘being’ is also used without *cid* to express concession. On Vedic secondary predicates with concessive meaning see also Keydana (2000: 370). Notice in addition that a second particle, *áha*, is used here to indicate a contrast between secondary and matrix predicate (Hejib 1984: 96).

The semantic criterion that has to be fulfilled for the hypothesis under investigation to be true is that all secondary predicates that exhibit *cid* have to express a concessive relation to the main predicate rather than a mere temporal overlap. Thus, if there is one text passage in which a secondary predicate with *cid* does not express a concessive relation to the main predicate, my hypothesis is false. In fact, the Rigveda does contain such passages. Consider the following example:

(243) <i>sanéma</i>	<i>vájam</i>	<i>táva</i>	<i>śiprin</i>
win:AOR.OPT.1PL	prize:ACC.SG.M	2SG.GEN	with.fair.lips:VOC.SG.M
<i>ávasā</i>	/	<i>makṣú</i>	<i>cid</i> <i>yánto</i>
help:INS.SG.N		quick:ACC.SG.N	PRT go:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.PL.M
<i>adrivaḥ</i>			
with.stone:VOC.SG.M			

‘Might we win the prize with your help, o you of fair lips, as we go quickly, o master of the stones.’ 8.61.4cd

I take *makṣú cid yántas* ‘going *CID* quickly’ as a relatively clear secondary predicate controlled by the first person null subject of the clause. I furthermore interpret *makṣú* as an adjunct of *yántas*. I assume that ‘going quickly’ is here related to the intended action of winning the prize and does not denote a permanent property of the subject. Yet, ‘going quickly’ is not an unfavorable circumstance for someone to win a price. On the contrary, it is advantageous or even necessary. As a result, there is clearly no concessive relation between the secondary and the main predicate that could be marked by *cid*. The question is then what the actual function of *cid* is in this example, for an additive interpretation ‘going also/even quickly’ does not seem to be appropriate in the given context.²⁶³ I surmise that its function here is that of a degree modifier, which I discussed in Section 4.5. This means that the secondary predicate may be rendered as ‘going very quickly’. Another case in which *cid* possibly occurs with a depictive is ex. (165) in Section 4.4.2.

By means of this example, I have demonstrated that *cid* cannot serve as a formal means to distinguish depictives from concessive circumstantials. Giving this issue a second thought, this does not seem all too surprising. Firstly, a parallel behavior is observable for the English particle *even*. In ex. (239), it is used to mark the concessive relation between the circumstantial and the main predicate. Compare, however, the following example:

(244) *Actually, nobody had assumed that he would survive the battle, but he returned even as a hero.*

²⁶³ See, however, Ludwig (1876–1888: II, 210): “beute mögen wir gewinnen, kieferstarker, durch deine gunst, schnell noch dazu gehnd, o steinbewerter”. In his commentary he (1876–1888: V, 165) glosses *makṣú cid* as ‘und zwar bald’.

Here, *even* occurs with the secondary predicate *as a hero* but it is not used to mark a concessive relation. Rather, as a scalar additive particle it marks this secondary predicate as an unlikely alternative given the fact that the controller was believed to die. Secondly, especially Section 4.6.2.1 has shown that structures that involve *cid* and are used to mark concessive conditional clauses can be formally identical to structures in which *cid* has another function. I have also shown parallel phenomena in German. Nevertheless, I believe that *cid* may serve as a first formal clue in the identification of concessive circumstantials, but I have also made clear the semantic relation between second and main predicate must not be neglected in this endeavor.

Even though the presence of *cid* may facilitate a categorization within the group of secondary predicates, it is still often difficult or even impossible to distinguish between secondary predicates and attributes or appositions (Casaretto & Reinöhl submitted). As a result, the question of whether *cid* is to be interpreted as part of a concessive circumstantial or not depends on the syntactic interpretation of the expression associated with *cid*. For instance, the status of the participle *dṛ̥l̥hásya* ‘firm’ is ambiguous in the following example:

(245) <i>dṛ̥l̥hásya</i>		<i>cid</i>	<i>gómato</i>	<i>ví</i>	<i>vrajásya</i>	/
make.firm:PPP.GEN.SG.M		PRT	with.cows:GEN.SG.M	LP	pen:GEN.SG.M	
<i>dúro</i>	<i>vartam</i>		<i>gṛ̥naté</i>			
door:ACC.PL.F	open:AOR.IMP.2DU		sing:PTCP.PRS.ACT.DAT.SG.M			
<i>citrarātī</i>						
with.bright.gifts:VOC.DU.M						

‘Open the doors of the cattle pen, **even though** they are shut fast, you who provide bright gifts for the singer.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 860)

‘Bountiful Lords, throw open to the singer the doors **e’en** of the firm-closed stall of cattle.’ (Griffith 1896–1897: I, 633) RV 6.62.11cd

According to the interpretation by Jamison & Brereton, *dṛ̥l̥hásya* is predicative, so that it constitutes a scalar concessive conditional.²⁶⁴ In contrast, Griffith interprets it as the attribute of *gómatas vrajásya* ‘of the cattle pen’. Due to ambiguities like this, it is not possible to determine how often *cid* occurs with circumstantials. It is, however, possible to delimit secondary predicates from other types of adjuncts. Consider the following example:

(246) <i>sá</i>	<i>dṛ̥l̥hé</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>abhí</i>	<i>ṭṛ̥natti</i>
DEM:NOM.SG.M	make.firm:PPP.LOC.SG.M	PRT	LP	bore:3SG
<i>vájam</i>	<i>árvatā</i>			
prize:ACC.SG.M	steed:INS.SG.M			

‘With a steed he bores through to the prize **even** in the stronghold’ RV 8.103.5a

²⁶⁴ A more literal translation would be ‘even though it is shut fast’, because *dṛ̥l̥hásya* ‘made firm’ agrees with *vrajásya* ‘of the pen’.

Lühr (1997: 64) treats this passage equally to ex. (234), which I have identified as a circumstantial secondary predicate. According to Lühr, who follows Geldner (1951–1957: II, 434), one can translate: ‘Even if this one is in a locked place, he bores through to the prize with a war horse’.²⁶⁵ Thus, she regards *dṛl̥hé* ‘in the stronghold’ as a circumstantial controlled by *sá* ‘he’. However, following Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann (2004: 62) secondary predicates commonly agree with their controllers and according to Casaretto & Reinöhl (submitted) and Casaretto (2020), this is also usually the case in Vedic, unless the controller is in the vocative case.²⁶⁶ Contrary to this observation, *sá* is in the nominative whereas *dṛl̥hé* is in the locative in ex. (246). As a result, I assume *dṛl̥hé* to be an event-oriented adjunct and not a circumstantial. I consider *cid* to have its usual function of a scalar additive particle, as is reflected in the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1216).²⁶⁷

Despite the difficulties, the syntactic interpretation of the word or expression associated with *cid* may also serve to account for the presence of *cid* and to obtain a better understanding of its function. This is the case in the following example, in which the word preceding *cid* has been interpreted as an attribute:

(247) <i>uśānti</i>	<i>ghā</i>	<i>té</i>	<i>amṛtāsa</i>	<i>etād</i>	/
want:3PL	PRT	DEM:NOM.SG.M	immortal:NOM.PL.M	DEM:ACC.SG.N	
<i>ékasya</i>	<i>cit</i>	<i>tyajāsam</i>	<i>mārtiyasya</i>		
one:GEN.SG.M	PRT	legacy:ACC.SG.M	mortal:GEN.SG.M		

‘The immortals *do* want this: a legacy of the mortal, **although** he is alone.’²⁶⁸ RV 10.10.3ab

This passage is taken from the dialogue between the first two humans, the twins Yamā and Yamī, in which Yamī, the speaker of ex. (247), tries to persuade Yamā to beget a child with her (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1381). Pāda b is translated by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1382) as ‘a legacy of the one and only mortal’, which means that they interpret *ékasya* ‘of the one’ as an attribute of *mārtiyasya* ‘of the mortal’ (cf. also Schnaus 2008: 170). Moreover, they seem to regard *cid* as a slack regulator similar to *íd* when it occurs after *éka-* (cf. Section 5.4.1). The latter interpretation is also reflected in Geldner (1907–1909: I, 63). This interpretation is somewhat problematic, because I argued in Section 4.1 that *cid* has a totalizing function when it occurs with numerals. This means it expresses that the full number is reached. The function of *íd* as a slack regulator after *éka-*, in contrast, is different. It decreases the tolerance of

²⁶⁵ ‘Selbst wenn dieser unter Verschluss ist, bahnt er sich mit dem Schlachtroß den Weg zum Gewinn’ (Lühr).

²⁶⁶ See Casaretto (2020: 39–43) for a discussion of apparent deviations.

²⁶⁷ Note that in certain cases, locative expressions can in fact function as secondary predicates (Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann 2004: 88–90). However, in ex. (246) the function of the locative is to locate the event, i.e. it is event-oriented.

²⁶⁸ The translation of pāda b deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

exceptions, i.e. it excludes the possibility that there is ever more than one person. In contrast, the totalizing function of *cid* should exclude that there is less than one person, which does not make sense in the given context. However, the presence of *cid* is explicable under the assumption that *ékasya* is not an attribute but a secondary predicate controlled by *mártiyasya*. For in this interpretation, *cid* serves to mark the concessive relation between the secondary and the main predicate. The interpretation as a secondary predicate is justifiable because there is a temporal overlap with *usánti* ‘they want’. If the gods intend Yama to establish a legacy, i.e. progeny,²⁶⁹ being the only human is not a permanent property and Yamī, as well as the Gods, explicitly want this state to end. The concessive interpretation is justifiable too, because being the only (male) human is an unfavorable circumstance to establish a legacy,²⁷⁰ especially when the only possible mate is his twin sister. Further support for this interpretation is provided by the following text passage:

(248) *ékasya* *cin* *me* *vibhú* *astu*
 one:GEN.SG.M PRT 1SG.GEN mighty:NOM.SG.N be:IMP.3SG

ójo
 force:NOM.SG.N

‘**Even if** I am alone, let my force be far ranging’ RV 1.165.10a

In his Glossary, Geldner (1907–1909: I, 63) assigns *cid* the same function that he does in ex. (247), but he himself (1951–1957: I, 239) opts for a translation that is in accordance with the reading of *ékasya cid* as a concessive circumstantial: ‘Auch wenn ich allein bin, muß meine Stärke genügend sein’. In the only remaining passage where *cid* occurs after *éka-*, the latter also means ‘alone’ and is part of a concessive circumstantial, but this time it occurs with the participle *sán* ‘being’:

(249) *ékaś* *cit* *sánn* *abhibhūtiḥ*
 one:NOM.SG.M PRT be:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.M overwhelming:NOM.SG.M

‘**Even though** alone, he is overwhelming.’ RV 8.16.8c

In both other Rigvedic passages where *cid* occurs after *éka-*, it is used to mark the numeral as (part of) a concessive circumstantial. I therefore consider it plausible to assume that this is also the case in ex. (247).

Like concessive conditional clauses, concessive circumstantials may be factual or non-factual, as a comparison of the following two examples shows:

²⁶⁹ The lexeme *tyajás-* is a hapax, the exact meaning of which is a matter of debate; see Geldner (1897: 32f. 1907–1909: I, 76, 1951–1957: III, 134), Oldenberg (1909–1912: II, 205), Renou (1955–1969: XVI, 122), Schnaus (2008: 170f.), Bodewitz (2009: 262f.), Pinault (2012: 149–151) and Jamison (comm.X.1: ad loc.).

²⁷⁰ Schnaus (2008: 171) surmises that *mártiyasya* might also denote a female mortal, but she admits herself that the grammatical gender is clearly masculine.

(250) *śusruvāmsā* *cid* *aśvinā* *purūṇi* / *abhī*
 hear:PTCP.PERF.ACT.NOM.DU.M PRT Aśvin:VOC.DU.M many:ACC.PL.N LP

bráhmāṇi *caḡṣāthe* *īṣīṇām*
 formulation:ACC.PL.N look:MID.2DU seer:GEN.PL.M

‘**Even though** you have heard many, Aśvins, you look upon the formulations of our seers.’ RV 7.70.5ab

(251) *yajñó* *hí* *ṣma* *índaraṃ* *kás* *cid*
 sacrifice:NOM.SG.M for PRT Indra:ACC.SG.M who:NOM.SG.M PRT

ṛndháñ / *juhurāṇás* *cin*
 succeed:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.M be.crooked:PTCP.AOR.MID.NOM.SG.M PRT

mánasā *pariyán* / [...] *óko* / [...]
 mind:INS.SG.M LP.go:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.M home:ACC.SG.N

á *krṇoti*
 LP do:3SG

‘For **any** sacrifice that reaches fulfillment, **even if** it swerves along, meandering in mind, brings Indra to the house’²⁷¹ RV 1.173.11

In ex. (250), the participle *śusruvāmsā* ‘having heard’ with its object *purūṇi* ‘many’ is probably a secondary predicate. It cannot be an attribute of *aśvinā* ‘o Aśvins’ because the latter form is a vocative (cf. Casaretto & Reinöhl submitted). The particle *cid* marks the concessive relation between the secondary and the main predicate because one might expect that the Aśvins do not want to hear any more formulations if they have already heard many. Here, the circumstance described in pāda a is probably factual, because the Aśvins, like other gods are regularly invoked by sacrificers and therefore have heard many formulations.²⁷²

In ex. (251), the concessive circumstantial *juhurāṇás cid mánasā pariyán* ‘even swerving around (and) meandering in mind’ is controlled by the nominal expression *yajñás kás cid ṛndhán* ‘every/any sacrifice that reaches fulfillment’, which contains a universal/free-choice quantifier. Since there is an indefinite number of sacrifices that reach fulfillment, the circumstantial secondary predicate describes but one among several possible circumstances under which a sacrifice brings Indra to the house (cf. Oldenberg 1909–1912: I, 173). This circumstance is especially unfavorable. Notice, however, that the interpretation of *juhurāṇás cid mánasā pariyán* as a secondary predicate is not the only possibility. For instance, Grassmann (1876–1877: II, 169) interprets *juhurāṇás cid* as an apposition.²⁷³ A further case of

²⁷¹ The translation deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

²⁷² On anteriority in secondary predicates see Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann (2004: 103f.).

²⁷³ ‘Denn jedes Opfer auch erquickt den Indra, selbst das verfehlte, wenn es gern gebracht ist’. On a different lexical interpretation of *juhurāṇás* as ‘being angry’ see Insler (1968: 220f.). Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 173) considers the possibility of reading an accusative *juhurāṇám* instead of the nominative *juhurāṇás* and to regard

a non-factual circumstantial is ex. (242), which contains the general statement that Agni does not seek out the sacrifice of the cheating mortal. That this sacrifice may be nearby is but one possible, unfavorable, circumstance under which Agni does not seek it out. Ex. (253) below is also similar.

The examples of Vedic concessive circumstantials that I have discussed thus far share the common feature that they involve the scalar additive function of *cid*. This means that they can be paraphrased in English as scalar concessive conditionals (cf. Nichols 1978: 116f.). In contrast, the following example involves a free-choice adverb and therefore can be paraphrased as a universal concessive conditional clause (Lühr 1997: 67):

(252) <i>tā́</i>	<i>vām</i>	<i>adyá</i>	<i>tāv</i>	<i>aparām</i>
DEM:ACC.DU.M	2DU.ACC	today	DEM:ACC.DU.M	later
<i>huvema</i>	/	<i>uchántiyām</i>		<i>uśási</i>
call:AOR.OPT.1PL		shine:PTCP.PRS.ACT.LOC.SG.F		dawn:LOC.SG.F
<i>váhnir</i>	<i>uktháih</i>	/	<i>nāsatiyā</i>	<i>kúha cid</i>
conductor:NOM.SG.M	speech:INS.PL.N		Nāsatya:ACC.DU.M	where PRT
<i>sántāv</i>	<i>aryó</i>	/	<i>divó</i>	
be:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.DU.M	stranger:ABL.SG.M		heaven:GEN.SG.M	
<i>nápātā</i>	<i>sudāstarāya</i>			
son:ACC.DU.M	giving.good.gifts:COMP.DAT.SG.M			

‘We would summon you today and you later on. When dawn is breaking, the conductor (of words) with solemn words (summons) the Nāsatyas, the sons of Heaven, **wherever** they are, for the man who gives even more than the stranger.’ RV 1.184.1

In this example, the syntactic boundaries as well as the case form of *nāsatiyā* have been interpreted differently. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 387) interpret it as an accusative whereas Griffith (1896–1897: I, 247) appears to interpret it as a vocative (Grassmann 1873: 726 explicitly analyzes the form as a vocative).²⁷⁴ However, in either interpretation *kúha cid sántau* ‘wherever being’ can relatively easily be identified as a secondary predicate because it refers to the whereabouts of the Nāsatyas specifically during the invocation and not in general. The free-choice proform, which is formed by the interrogative adverb *kúha* ‘where’ and *cid* (cf. Section 4.3.1), expresses the irrelevance of this circumstance. As a result, this is a case of a concessive circumstantial.

índram as the controller. Both interpretations are combined in the translation by Griffith (1896–1897: I, 239): ‘For every sacrifice makes Indra stronger, yea, when he goes around angry in spirit’.

²⁷⁴ ‘LET us invoke you both this day and after: the priest is here with lauds when morn is breaking: Nāsatyas, wheresoe’er ye be’ (Griffith).

As a last point regarding secondary predicates, I would like to draw the reader’s attention to the fact that concessive circumstantials, like concessive conditional clauses, are attested with different levels of linking. Compare the following examples:

- (253) *sunvábhiyo* *randhayā* *kám* *cid*
 press:PTCP.PRS.ACT.DAT.PL.M subdue:IMP.2SG who:ACC.SG.M PRT
avratám / *hr̥ṇāyántam* *cid* *avratám*
 lawless:ACC.SG.M rage:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.SG.M PRT lawless:ACC.SG.M

For those who press soma, weaken anyone who follows no commandment—who follows no commandment, **even** when he rages.’ RV 1.132.4fg

- (254) *druhó* *níṣattā* *pr̥śanī́* *cid* *évaiḥ*
 deceit:GEN.SG.F LP.sit:PPP.NOM.SG.F caressing:NOM.SG.F PRT activity:INS.PL.M

‘She, **even though** caressing (him), was sunk down because of the activities of (demonic?) deceit.’ RV 10.73.2a

The first passage seems to exhibit linking at the content level. The poet tells the addressee to weaken everyone when they rage, as well as at other times. The second passage is difficult to interpret but probably describes the actions of Indra’s mother (Oldenberg 1909–1912: II, 276). According to the interpretation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1502) this passage expresses that Indra’s mother was deceitful despite the fact that she was caressing him, which is actually a sign of love, so that the circumstantial is linked to the main predicate at the content level. Oldenberg surmises that she was *druhás évais* because she did not like her child in the beginning. Notice that according to this interpretation the circumstantial *pr̥śanī́ cid* ‘even (though) caressing’ is controlled by a null subject.

For the concessive conditional clauses in Section 4.6.2, I have only found linking at the illocutionary and the content level. The following text passage from a hymn dedicated to Agni may exhibit a circumstantial which is linked to the main predicate on the epistemic level, but this assumption is only tentative:

- (255) *utá* *púrvām̐* *avanor* *vr̥ádhataś*
 and previous:ACC.PL.M vanquish:IPRF.2SG be.strong:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.PL.M
cit
 PRT

‘And [...] you vanquished the former (fires), **even** though they were greatly arrogant.’ RV 10.69.10d

Following Grassmann (1873: 1364), the verb *vr̥ádh-* means ‘be great, strong’. However, Geldner (1951–1957: III, 247) translates it as ‘feel strong’ in this passage.²⁷⁵ Similarly, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1494) translate it as ‘be greatly arrogant’ (see Jamison comm.X.2: ad RV

²⁷⁵ ‘hast du auch die früheren (Feinde) überwunden, wenn sie noch so stark sich fühlten’.

10.49.8). These translations are justifiable because compared to Agni, his competitors are not actually strong but merely consider themselves to be strong at best. Given that this interpretation is correct, *vrādhataś cid* is linked to the main predicate on the epistemic level. The poet does not really know the state of mind or attitude of Agni’s competitors but can only draw conclusions from their behavior. However, an interpretation implying a link on the content level is possible as well, as the translation by Griffith (1896–1897: II, 482) shows: ‘Thou [...] didst vanquish those of old though they were mighty’. According to this interpretation, the poet expresses that Agni vanquished his competitors despite the fact that they were actually strong.

Before concluding this section concerning secondary predicates, it seems interesting to discuss one particular non-finite verb form, which is called absolutive or gerund. In Vedic, absolutes are subordinate to the finite verb and denote actions that took place prior to the one denoted by the latter (Macdonell 1916: 332f.).²⁷⁶ From a typological perspective, these forms can be characterized as converbs, i.e. “a nonfinite verb form whose main function is to mark adverbial subordination” (Haspelmath 1995: 3). Following Haspelmath (1995: 17–20), converb constructions are similar to secondary predicates and may be difficult to distinguish from them.²⁷⁷ Thus, Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann (2004: 98–107) argue that converbs may also function as depictives. Despite the similarities, Casaretto & Reinöhl (submitted) find a distinction between Vedic absolutes and depictives unproblematic due to the anteriority that is expressed by absolutes. This excludes a temporal overlap between the events expressed by the absolutive and the main predicate. Nevertheless, it is interesting to compare the functions that *cid* has when it occurs with secondary predicates and with absolutes. Unfortunately, the Rigveda contains only one passage in which *cid* follows an absolutive, namely in a hymn dedicated to Indra:

(256) <i>abhivlāgyā</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>adrivaḥ</i>	/	<i>śīrṣā</i>
LP.attack:CVB	PRT	with.stone:VOC.SG.M		head:ACC.PL.N
<i>yātumātīnām</i>	/	<i>chindhī</i>	<i>vaṭūrīṇā</i>	<i>padā</i>
witch:GEN.PL.F		cut.off:IMP.2SG	?:INS.SG.M	foot:INS.SG.M

‘**Even** after you strewed (them) on the ground, you with the stone, the heads of the witches, cleave with the ...?... foot’ (Witzel & Gotō 2007: 248)²⁷⁸

‘You **also** having attacked, o possessor of the stone: cut off the heads of the witches with your foot that overcomes obstacles’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 303) RV 1.133.2a–c

²⁷⁶ The gerund in *-am* denotes a simultaneous event but is only attested in younger texts.

²⁷⁷ He primarily refers to participle constructions.

²⁷⁸ ‘Sogar nachdem du (sie) hingestreut hast, du mit dem Stein, die Köpfe der Zauberinnen, zerspalte mit dem ...?... Fuße’.

With respect to this passage, there are two competing views with respect to the interpretation of *cid*, which appear to be the result of different interpretations of the lexical meaning of the preceding absolutive. The first one is the interpretation by Witzel & Gotō (2007: 248; 695f.), who translate the verb *vlag-* with the local particle *abhi* as ‘strew down’ but concede that the meaning is unclear. Consequently, the absolutive ‘having strewn (them) down’ is in a concessive relation with the request expressed by the main predicate. For when the heads of the witches are already lying on the ground it will be an unnecessary effort to cleave them. However, the poet considers this to be irrelevant for uttering his request. Unlike Witzel & Gotō, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 303) translate *abhi vlag-* as ‘attack’ (see Jamison comm.I.2: ad loc. on ex. (257)). Then, *cid* does not mark a concessive relation between *abhivlāgyā* ‘having attacked’ and the main predicate *chindhī* ‘cut off’. On the contrary, there appears to be a causal link, again at the illocutionary level: The fact that Indra has already attacked the enemies causes the poet or ask/command him to “finish the job” and cut off their heads. This means that *cid* must have another function so that Jamison & Brereton (2014: 303) render it as the non-scalar additive ‘also’ and I agree with their interpretation. In such an interpretation, one would expect the preceding word, i.e. the absolutive, to constitute or be part of the focus of *cid*. In order to verify this assumption, it is necessary to consider the preceding stanza:

(257) <i>drúho</i>	<i>dahāmi</i>	<i>sám</i>	<i>mahīr</i>	<i>anindrāḥ</i>	/
deceit:ACC.PL.F	burn:1SG	LP	great:ACC.PL.F	without.Indra:ACC.PL.F	
<i>abhivlāgya</i>	<i>yātra</i>	<i>hatā</i>	<i>amitrā</i>	/	
LP.attack:CVB	where	hit:PPP.NOM.PL.M	enemy:NOM.PL.M		
<i>vailasthānām</i>		<i>pāri</i>	<i>tṛlḥā</i>	<i>áseran</i>	
lurking.place:ACC.SG.N		LP	crush:PPP:NOM.PL.M	lie:IPRF.3PL	

‘the deceits—great, but lacking Indra—I burn up entirely, where the enemies, having attacked, lay slain, crushed all around the Place of Hostility.’ RV 1.133.1b–d

The first striking observation is that in pāda c of this stanza the absolutive *abhivlāgya*, i.e. the same form that precedes *cid* in the following stanza, occurs. This suggests that in ex. (256) *abhivlāgya* is not the focus of *cid* since ‘having attacked’ here is not added to having performed another action. Rather, it is the same action which is performed by different people. As a result, in ex. (256) the addressee, i.e. Indra, is added to another group of entities that have attacked, viz. the enemies.²⁷⁹ However, even though the repetition of the absolutive favors this

²⁷⁹ Tikkanen (1987: 140) tentatively suggests that the absolutive in ex. (257) might have a passive interpretation, which would contradict this analysis. However since he finds only this Rigvedic passage with a possible passive reading of an absolutive, he also suggests another interpretation which is in accordance with the one I have mentioned here: “Whereas the gerund **abhivlāgya** in [ex. (257)] might refer to an obnoxious activity on the part of the slain enemies, in the following [stanza, i.e. ex. (144)] it would refer to a retaliatory action on the part of the conquerors”.

interpretation, it is also possible that the alternative value to Indra are not the enemies but the poet himself. For his burning up the deceits is also a form of attack. Moreover, in this case it would not only be the action of attacking which is the same for both alternatives but also the type of enemies, namely deceits and witches, i.e. evil entities. Both of these interpretations entail that even though *cid* follows the absolutive *abhivlāgya*, it is not the action it denotes which is focused and thus added to another action. Rather, it indicates that the same action is performed by different actors. Notice that the English translation requires ‘also’ to be stressed in order to produce this reading: ‘You ALSO having attacked ...’. In my opinion, the context suggests that the interpretation by Jamison & Brereton is to be preferred over the one by Witzel & Gotō, but I do not want to rule out the latter one. The main problem is here that the meaning of the verb *vlag-*, the only two attestations of which are the ones discussed here, is not clear (Tikkanen 1987: 140; Witzel & Gotō 2007: 695f.).

Since this is the only example of *cid* following an absolutive in the Rigveda it is not possible to determine what exactly its functions are in this context. It may well be that in Rigvedic times it was used to overtly mark a concessive relation between an absolutive and its main predicate, as with concessive circumstantials, but the Rigveda does not provide sufficient data to prove this assumption.

4.7 *cid* as a particularizer

In addition to being assigned the function of an additive and an exclusive particle, *cid* is also sometimes assumed to function as a particularizer. Thus, Macdonell (1893: 94) renders it also as ‘at least’. This section is dedicated to passages where *cid* possibly has this function. As I outlined in Section 2, I follow Quirk et al. (1985 [2008]: 604), König (1991: 96f.) and De Cesare (2015: 64f.) and do not include elements like *exactly* in the class of particularizers. On functions of *cid* comparable to those of *exactly* see Section 4.8.

That a particle may have both additive and particularizing function is attested outside of Vedic Sanskrit. One such example is the Greek particle *καί*, which means ‘and, also, even’ but also ‘in particular’ (Bonifazi et al. 2016: IV.2, §§93–137; Crespo 2017a, 2017b: 141f.).²⁸⁰ Dunkel (2014: 245) assigns additive and particularizing function (‘auch, dazu, noch; besonders, sogar’) to Proto-Indo-Iranian **ápi*, the reflex of which in later Sanskrit has been said to have similar functions to Rigvedic *cid*. As for Rigvedic *cid*, the function of a particularizer appears

²⁸⁰ West (2011: 100f.) translates *cid*’s Old Avestan cognate *cī* as “‘X at least’ or ‘even X’”.

to be marginal at best, if it is present at all. Jamison & Brereton (2014) translate one instance of *cid* as ‘especially’. This case is ex. (181) in Section 4.5, where I argue that *cid* functions as a degree modifier and the translation ‘especially’ by Jamison & Brereton is probably also to be understood as a degree modifier rather than a particularizer.²⁸¹ In one instance they translate *cid* as ‘at least’ (RV 4.3.4). Witzel & Gotō (2007) and Witzel et al. (2013) translate it as ‘especially’ (‘besonders’) in one passage (RV 2.27.5).²⁸² Geldner (1951–1957) translates it once as ‘zumal’ (RV 7.27.3) and twice as ‘besonders’ (RV 2.27.5; 10.132.3). In RV 10.132.3, I consider it to have connective function in combination with the preceding *ádha* ‘then’ rather than to be construed with the following *nú* ‘now’ as Geldner would have it. Twice, Geldner translates it as ‘at least’ (‘wenigstens’) (RV 4.3.4; 7.57.5). In none of these translations do all translators agree on the exact function of *cid*. I will discuss two of these passages in order illustrate the uncertainties regarding the interpretation:

(258) <i>vidyám</i>		<i>ādityā</i>		<i>ávaso</i>		<i>vo</i>
know:PERF.OPT.1SG		Āditya:VOC.PL.M		help:GEN.SG.N		2PL.GEN
<i>asyá</i>	/	<i>yád</i>		<i>aryaman</i>		<i>bhayá</i>
DEM:GEN.SG.N		REL:NOM.SG.N		Aryaman:VOC.SG.M		fear:LOC.SG.N
<i>á</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>mayobhú</i>				
LP	PRT	delighting:NOM.SG.N				

‘Might I know this help of yours, o Ādityas, which **even** in time of fear is joy, o Aryaman.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 440)

‘..., which **especially** in time of fear is joy, ...’ (see footnote 283) RV 2.27.5ab

(259) <i>tuvám</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>naḥ</i>	<i>śámiyā</i>	<i>agne</i>
2SG.NOM	PRT	1PL.GEN	labor:GEN.SG.F	Agni:VOC.SG.M
<i>asyá</i>	/	<i>ṛtásya</i>	<i>bodhi</i>	
DEM:GEN.SG.F		truth:GEN.SG.N	perceive:AOR.IMP.2SG	
<i>ṛtacit</i>		<i>suādhīḥ</i>		
perceiving.truth:VOC.SG.M		thoughtful:NOM.SG.M		

‘Agni, **at least** become aware of this (ritual) labor of ours, of (our expression of) truth, o perceiver of truth, as one who is very concerned.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 562)

‘Agni, you **too** become aware of this (ritual) labor of ours, ...’ (my adaptation) RV 4.3.4ab

Geldner (1951–1957: I, 310) and Witzel & Gotō (2007: 394) translate the *cid* in ex. (258) as ‘besonders’ and Renou (1955–1969: V, 103) translates it as ‘surtout’.²⁸³ The English equivalent of these translations is ‘especially’, i.e. a particularizer. This interpretation is justified by the

²⁸¹ See König (1991: 97) on the relationship between particularizers and degree modifiers.

²⁸² Notice that the translation by Witzel & Gotō (2007) and Witzel et al. (2013) comprises only books 1–5.

²⁸³ ‘Ich möchte, ihr Āditya’s, diese Gunst von euch erfahren, die besonders in Gefahr tröstlich ist, o Aryaman’ (Geldner); ‘Ich möchte, ihr Ādityas, von dieser eurer Hilfe wissen, die besonders in Gefahr erquickend ist, Aryaman’ (Witzel & Gotō); ‘Je voudrais connaître, ô Āditya’s, cette faveur vôtre qui est réconfortante, ô Aryaman, surtout dans le danger’ (Renou).

context: In a dangerous situation, people may be desperate and hope that someone will help them. When his help finally reaches them, their relief will probably be bigger than in times when they have nothing to fear anyway. Thus, the help of the Ādityas is particularly welcome in time of fear. Even though this interpretation is justifiable, it is not the only possible one. One can also assume that among the circumstances in which people experience joy, danger is an unlikely one. Thus, it is very well possible that *cid* marks *bhayé* ‘in danger’ as an unlikely alternative. In this case, it functions as a scalar additive particle and can be rendered as ‘even’, as it is in the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 440), which is given in ex. (258). Another fact which has to be taken into account is that *cid* does not occur directly after *bhayé* but after *á*, which could be a local or an emphatic particle here. RIVELEX (II, 26) analyzes it as an emphatic particle. As such, it has a function similar to *íd* (Dunkel 1997a: 12f.; Casaretto 2017: 66). Moreover, the collocation *á cid* is assigned a special function different to that of *cid* alone (see Section 4.10). However, even the collocation *á cid* does not appear to have particularizing function elsewhere. As a result, even though the interpretations by Geldner, Witzel & Gotō and Renou are indeed justifiable, the one represented by Jamison & Brereton is in my opinion more advantageous. For it reflects the regularly attested meaning of *cid* as a scalar additive particle and does not have to assume an additional, only rarely attested, meaning.

Consider now ex. (259), where the function of *cid* is unclear as well. Griffith (1896–1897: I, 397) apparently tries to integrate *cid* in his translation by regarding the vocative *ṛtacit* ‘knower of truth’ as a concessive circumstantial secondary predicate controlled by *tvám*: ‘Even as true knower of the Law, O Agni, to this our solemn rite be thou attentive’. I do not consider this possible. I furthermore reject the interpretation by Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 111), according to which *cid* modifies the verb.²⁸⁴ Jamison & Brereton (2014: 562) and Geldner (1951–1957: I, 420) both translate *cid* as ‘at least/wenigstens’.²⁸⁵ Following König (1991: 46), *at least* and *wenigstens* “seem to [be] the expressive means for evaluating an entity as ‘medium’, i.e. as neither maximal nor minimal”. Jamison (comm.IV: ad loc.) elaborates that “[t]his somewhat testy note seems to introduce the next part of the hymn, with its anxious or annoyed questions to Agni about his relationship to the sacrificers and how he will represent it to the other gods”. She remarks that Jamison & Brereton follow Geldner in his translation of *cid*. In this interpretation, one has to assume that the focus, which is probably *nas śámiyās asyās* ‘of these ritual labors of ours’, follows *cid*. Renou (1955–1969: XIII, 6), Scarlata (1999: 121) and Witzel

²⁸⁴ ‘Beachte recht dies unser Werk, o Agni, den frommen Brauch, o Kenner frommen Brauches’.

²⁸⁵ “Merke du wenigstens auf diesen Opferdienst von uns, o Agni, wohlmeinend auf das rechte Werk, des Rechten Kundiger!” (Geldner).

et al. (2013: 120) leave *cid* untranslated.²⁸⁶ Perhaps the “testy note” perceived by Jamison (comm.IV: ad loc.) is a hint toward the interpretation of *cid*. The most straightforward interpretation of *cid* seems to be that of an additive particle whose focus is *tvám* ‘you’, but the problem regarding this text passage is who the alternative values to Agni might be. I tentatively suggest that the referents of *nas* ‘our’, i.e. the people involved in the ritual, are the alternative. Perhaps the intended meaning of this hemistich can be paraphrased as ‘Become aware of our ritual labors, Agni, because up to now it seems that only we are aware of them because we are working hard, but we do not want to do this in vain’. A translation of *cid* as an additive particle is also found in Ludwig (1876–1888: I, 354), but he interprets the verb differently. Oldenberg (1897: 325) leaves *cid* untranslated.²⁸⁷

In the last passage that I would like to discuss here, interpreting *cid* as a particularizer should be considered an option, namely the following pāda from a hymn dedicated to Indra:

(260) <i>códad</i>	<i>rádha</i>	<i>úpastutas</i>	<i>cid</i>
impel:INJ.3SG	largesse:ACC.SG.N	LP.praise:PPP.NOM.SG.M	PRT
<i>arvák</i>			
towards.here:ACC.SG.N			

‘he impels largesse nearby, **just** when he is praised.’ RV 7.27.3d

Jamison (comm.VII: ad loc.) remarks that the presence of *cid* “is somewhat surprising” because its regular scalar additive meaning should yield a concessive reading of the participle *úpastutas* ‘praised’ (cf. Section 4.6.3), which is inappropriate in this context.²⁸⁸ The non-scalar interpretation by Griffith (1896–1897: II, 28) seems odd to me too: ‘may he enrich us also when we laud him’. As a result, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 916) translate *cid* as ‘just’. This is possible, although I am not entirely certain what their intended meaning of ‘just’ is in their translation. If it were exclusive it would mean that it is necessary to praise Indra if one wants to be favored by him. An alternative interpretation can be found in the translation by Hoffmann (1967: 117f.), who interprets *cid* as a particularizer.²⁸⁹ This would mean that Indra is generally generous but even more when he is praised, which I also consider plausible. This is also in

²⁸⁶ ‘Toi, ô Agni, prête attention à cette activité-rituelle de nous, à l’Ordre-sacrificiel, ô toi qui comprends l’Ordre, toi dont les intentions sont bonnes !’ (Renou); ‘Achte du, o Agni, der du dich auf das Ṛta verstehst, fürsorglich auf diesen unseren Opferdienst, auf das Ṛta’ (Scarlata); ‘Wenn es dich angeht, merke auf diese Anstrengungen von uns, Agni, auf das Ṛta, du des Ṛta Bewußter, mit guter Absicht!’ (Witzel et al.).

²⁸⁷ ‘werde uns auch du, o Agni, zu disem opferwerke, als der ordnung warhafter kenner zum fürsorger’ (Ludwig); ‘Thou who art well-intentioned, give heed to this our toiling, to this *Rita*, O observer of *Rita* !’ (Oldenberg).

²⁸⁸ Velankar (1963b: 69) assigns it such a function nevertheless: ‘may he urge his bounty towards us, even when praised on the spot’.

²⁸⁹ ‘Er treibt, insbesondere wenn er gepriesen ist, die Freigiebigkeit herbei’.

accordance with Geldner (1951–1957: II, 205) ‘especially because’ (‘zumal da’).²⁹⁰ This is all the more plausible because Indra is described as *maghāvā* ‘bounteous’ in the next stanza:

(261) <i>nū́</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>índro</i>	<i>maghāvā</i>	
now	PRT	1PL.GEN	Indra:NOM.SG.M	bounteous:NOM.SG.M	
<i>sáhū́tī</i>		/	<i>dānó</i>	<i>vájam</i>	<i>ní</i>
conjoined.call:INS.SG.F			giving:ABL.SG.N	spoil:ACC.SG.M	LP
<i>yamate</i>			<i>na</i>	<i>ū́tī</i>	
hold:AOR.SBJV.MID.3SG			1PL.DAT	help:INS.SG.F	

‘Never does bounteous Indra, because of (another) call coincident with ours, hold back from giving spoils along with help to us’ RV 7.27.4ab

This following hemistich leads Jamison (comm.VII: ad loc.) to consider yet another interpretation of *cid*. She tentatively suggests that “it expresses anticipatory polarity with *nū́ cid* in the following pāda (4a). Since *nū́ cid* means ‘never’, *cid* in 3d could mean ‘always’”. However, in Section 4.4.2, I argued that *cid* alone cannot function as a quantifier.

By means of the three examples that I have discussed in this brief section, I have aimed to show that the assumption of a particularizing function of *cid* is possible in some cases but nowhere is it certain. In ex. (258), it is possible to assign *cid* its regular function of a scalar additive particle. Moreover, it is not certain whether *cid* functions alone or in combination with *ā́*. In ex. (259), I tentatively suggest a non-scalar additive value of *cid* instead of a particularizing one. In ex. (260), the assumption that *cid* is a particularizer appears to be the most plausible one to me, but there have been other interpretations as well. Apart from the three examples that I have discussed explicitly here, I have found no instance of *cid* in the Rigveda where an interpretation as a particularizer is compelling either.

4.8 Shared functions of *cid* and *íd*

In Section 5, I will conduct a detailed analysis of the particle *íd* and I will identify a number of different functions that this particle has. Several of these functions are also shared by *cid* and this section is dedicated to their identification and description. I will argue that *cid* can be used as an exclusive particle, to mark exhaustive focus and as an identifier. Moreover, it can have intensificatory function, indicate marginal phase and function as a slack regulator. In my analysis of *íd*, I have dedicated separate sections to these functions. However, as these functions are not attested as abundantly for *cid* as for *íd*, I will discuss them all in this section. Note as well that in this section I will only briefly introduce the terminology and the parameters

²⁹⁰ ‘Er sporne, zumal da er gepriesen ward, die Freigebigkeit nach unserer Seite an’.

according to which exclusive and related particles can be classified. For more detailed explanations see the respective sections on *íd*. On comparable functions of the cognate particle =*ci* in Old Persian see Coenen (2020–2021 [2022]: 41–62).

In the literature on *cid*, the functions that it shares with *íd* have received rather marginal attention. Thus, for instance, in his dictionary entry, Grassmann (1873: 454f.) does not mention them, as is also the case, for instance, in the short description in the grammar by Renou (1952: 376). Others do, however, recognize an exclusive or similar functions, for instance Monier-Williams (1872: 325), who assigns *cid* also the meanings ‘just,’ and ‘merely’,²⁹¹ or Macdonell (1893: 94), who gives ‘just’ as a possible translation. Jamison (comm.III: ad RV 3.53.22) even speaks of the “usual ‘even, even though, just’ sense” of *cid*. I will begin my investigation with text passages in which *cid* possibly functions as an exclusive particle. One of these passages is the following:

(262) <i>hótā</i>	<i>nīṣatto</i>	<i>mānor</i>	<i>ápatye</i>	/
Hotar:NOM.SG.M	LP.sit:PPP.NOM.SG.M	Manu:GEN.SG.M	progeny:LOC.SG.N	
<i>sá</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>nú</i>	<i>āsām</i>	<i>pátī</i>
DEM:NOM.SG.M	PRT	now	DEM:GEN.PL.F	lord:NOM.SG.M
<i>rayīṅām</i>				
wealth:GEN.PL.F				

‘As the Hotar, he has taken his seat among the progeny of Manu. **Just** he is now the lord of these (offspring/clans? and) of riches.’ RV 1.68.7

This example is taken from a hymn addressed to Agni, who is the referent of *sá* ‘he’. The first clause describes Agni’s roll as the Hotar, i.e. the priest (cf. Oldenberg 1894: 103; 129; Brereton & Jamison 2020: 73f.). The question is how to interpret *cid* in the following clause. Oldenberg (1897: 64) apparently interprets it as an emphazier (cf. Section 5.7), for he translates ‘he verily is the master of all these riches’. Cf. also Renou (1955–1969: XII, 15).²⁹² I do not assume that *cid* has this function. I believe that a plausible interpretation of *cid* in this passage is the one reflected in the translations by Geldner (1951–1957: I, 89), Witzel & Gotō (2007: 127) and Jamison & Brereton (2014: 191),²⁹³ namely that *cid* is a non-scalar exclusive particle. It expresses that Agni is the lord of the riches (etc.?) and nobody else is. As with *íd*, it is difficult to differentiate between the exclusive use and exhaustive focus. Thus, *cid* may also express exhaustive focus here, i.e. that nobody instead of Agni is the lord. In this case, one might translate pāda b with a cleft ‘It’s he who is now the lord ...’. The following example shows that

²⁹¹ Monier-Williams (1899: 398) does not give these translations anymore.

²⁹² ‘c’est bien (Agni) qui est le maître de ces richesses’.

²⁹³ ‘ist nur er der Herr dieser Reichtümer’ (Geldner); ‘Nur er ist nun der Herr dieser Reichtümer’ (Witzel & Gotō).

the exclusive use of *cid* is comparable to that of *íd*. Here, in the same hymn and after the same word, *íd* and *cid* are both used as exclusive particles:

(263) <i>maháh</i>		<i>samudráṃ</i>	<i>váruṇas</i>	<i>tiró</i>	<i>dadhe</i>	/
great:NOM.SG.M		sea:ACC.SG.M	Varuṇa:NOM.SG.M	through	put:PERF.MID.3SG	
<i>dhírā</i>	<i>íc</i>	<i>chekur</i>		<i>dharúṇesu</i>	<i>ārābham</i>	//
wise:NOM.PL.M	PRT	be.able:PERF.3PL		support:LOC.PL.M	grab:INF.ACC	
[...]	<i>rtásya</i>		<i>tántur</i>		<i>vítataḥ</i>	
	truth:GEN.SG.N		thread:NOM.SG.M		LP.stretch:PPP.NOM.SG.M	
<i>pavitra</i>	<i>ā</i>	/	<i>jihváyā</i>	<i>ágre</i>	<i>váruṇasya</i>	
filter:LOC.SG.N	LP		tongue:GEN.SG.F	tip:LOC.SG.N	Varuṇa:GEN.SG.N	
<i>māyáyā</i>		/	<i>dhírās</i>	<i>cit</i>	<i>tát</i>	
magical.wile:INS.SG.F			wise:NOM.PL.M	PRT	DEM:ACC.SG.N	
<i>samínakṣanta</i>				<i>āśata</i>	/	<i>átrā kartám</i>
LP.reach:DES.PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.PL.M				reach:AOR.MID.3PL	here	pit:ACC.SG.M
<i>áva</i>	<i>padāti</i>		<i>áprabhuḥ</i>			
LP	fall:AOR.SBJV.3SG		unable:NOM.SG.M			

‘As great Varuṇa, (Soma) has hidden himself in the sea. **Only** the insightful have been able to take hold of his supports. [...]

9. The thread of truth is stretched widely, here on the filter and on the tip of the tongue, through the magic power of Varuṇa. **Only** the insightful, seeking to reach it together, have attained it. The one who does not advance will fall down into the pit here.’ RV 9.73.3c–9

In this hymn, *dhírās íd* ‘only the insightful’ occurs in stanza 3 and *dhírās cid* ‘only the insightful’ occurs in stanza 9.²⁹⁴ For the latter, I am not certain whether *dhírās* is a simple nominal expression or whether *samínakṣantas* ‘seeking to reach it together’ is a restrictive modifier. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1307) appear to interpret it as non-restrictive. For both *íd* and *cid* seem to exclude all other alternatives to *dhírās*, for it seems plausible that only ‘the insightful’ attain what is hidden or stretched widely. A difference between the occurrence of *íd* and *cid* is that in stanza 9, ‘the one that does not advance’ appears to be an alternative to the focus of *cid* in pāda d. In stanza 3, no overt alternative is mentioned for the focus of *íd*. However, ex. (262) shows that this is not a general distinction between *íd* and *cid*, because there no alternative of the focus of *cid* is mentioned overtly either. Moreover, ex. (341) in Section 5.1 shows that *íd* occurs with overtly mentioned alternatives to its focus too. The assumption that *cid* has the same function as *íd* in ex. (263) is further supported by Jamison’s (comm. IX.2:ad loc.) observation that the structure of stanza 9 strongly resembles RV 9.83.1. This stanza contains *íd*:

²⁹⁴ Cf. also Renou (1955–1969: IX, 23). I am not sure how to interpret the translation ‘auch nur’ by Geldner (1951–1957: III, 68) in pāda 9c: ‘Auch nur die Sachkundigen, die das zu erreichen suchen, haben es erreicht’.

(264) <i>átaptatanūr</i> unheated:NOM.SG.M	<i>ná</i> NEG	<i>tád</i> DEM:ACC.SG.N	<i>āmó</i> raw:NOM.SG.M
<i>aśnute</i> reach:PRS.MID.3SG	/	<i>śṛtāsa</i> cook:PPP.NOM.PL.M	<i>íd</i> PRT
<i>tát</i> DEM:ACC.SG.N		<i>sám</i> LP	<i>āśata</i> reach:AOR.MID.3SG

‘A raw one, with unheated body, does not attain it [=filter]; **only** the cooked ones, driving along, have attained it entirely.’ RV 9.83.1cd

In the following text passage, I tentatively assume that additive and exclusive *cid* are found in subsequent stanzas after the same word:

(265) <i>sá</i> DEM:NOM.SG.M	<i>pítriyāṇi</i> ancestral:ACC.PL.N	<i>āyudhāni</i> weapon:ACC.PL.N	
<i>vidvān</i> know:PTCP.PERF.ACT.NOM.SG.M	/	<i>índreṣita</i> urged.by.Indra:NOM.SG.M	<i>āptiyó</i> Āptya:NOM.SG.M
<i>abhy</i> LP	<i>āyudhyat</i> fight:IPRF.3SG	/	<i>triśīrṣāṇam</i> three.headed:ACC.SG.M
			<i>saptáraśmim</i> seven.reined:ACC.SG.M
<i>jaḡhanvān</i> hit:PTCP.PERF.ACT.NOM.SG.M	/	<i>tvāṣṭrāsya</i> from.Tvaṣṭar:GEN.SG.M	<i>cin</i> PRT
			<i>nīḡ</i> LP
<i>sasṛje</i> release:PERF.MID.3SG	<i>tritó</i> Trita:NOM.SG.M	<i>gāḡ</i> cow:ACC.PL.F	//
			<i>bhūríd</i> much:ACC.SG.N+PRT
<i>índra</i> Indra:NOM.SG.M	<i>udínakṣantam</i> LP.reach:DES.PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.SG.M		<i>ójo</i> power:ACC.SG.N
			/
<i>āvābhinat</i> LP.cleft:IPRF.3SG	<i>sátpatir</i> lord:NOM.SG.M	<i>mānyamānam</i> think:PTCP.PRS.MID.ACC.SG.M	/
<i>tvāṣṭrāsya</i> from.Tvaṣṭar:GEN.SG.M	<i>cid</i> PRT	<i>viśvárūpasya</i> Viśvarūpa:GEN.SG.M	<i>gónām</i> cow:GEN.PL.F
			/
<i>ācakrāṇás</i> do:PTCP.PERF.MID.NOM.SG.M	<i>trīṇi</i> three:ACC.PL.N	<i>śīrṣá</i> head:ACC.PL.N	<i>pārā</i> LP
<i>vark</i> twist:AOR.INJ.3SG			

‘8. That one, Āptya, knowing his ancestral weapons, urged on by Indra, attacked. Having smashed the three-headed, seven-reined (monster), Trita let loose the cows, **even** those of Tvaṣṭar’s son.

9. Indra split (the heads) off the one trying to reach up to much power—the lord of settlements (split them off) the one who thought himself (the same). Having made the cows of Viśvarūpa, the son of Tvaṣṭar, his own, he twisted off his three heads.’ RV 10.8.8–9

These stanzas describe how Indra and Trita Āptya kill Viśvarūpa, the son of Tvaṣṭar (cf. Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1376–1378). In stanza 8, the translations by Geldner (1951–1957: III, 131), Renou (1955–1969: XIV, 7f.), Velankar (1958: 10f.) and Jamison & Brereton (2014:

1379) suggest that they assume *cid* to have narrow focus on *tvāṣṭrāsya* ‘of Tvaṣṭar’s son’.²⁹⁵ This presupposes that there are more cows than only those of Viśvarūpa. Furthermore, the scalar interpretation of *cid* suggests that Tvaṣṭar’s cows are special with respect to the others. In the next stanza, all four leave *cid* untranslated.²⁹⁶ Since in stanza 8 the cows of Viśvarūpa have already been added to the cows that are released and also marked as an unlikely alternative, it seems implausible that they are again added to the released cows in the next stanza. I therefore tentatively suggest an interpretation of the second *cid* as an exclusive particle, which is in accordance with the scalar additive interpretation of the first *cid*. I suggest changing Jamison & Brereton’s translation of pādas 9cd as ‘Having made only the cows of Viśvarūpa, the son of Tvaṣṭar, his own, he twisted off his three heads’. By this the poet might want to express that he took only the best cows and let the others go. With respect to my analysis, I must concede that an additive interpretation cannot be excluded entirely. It may be that the poet wants to stress again how astonishing it is that Indra made the cows of Viśvarūpa his own, so that he uses the scalar additive particle here redundantly.

The following occurrence of *cid* in a hymn for Agni is probably also explicable by its exclusive function, for otherwise it would be difficult to interpret:

(266) <i>nītye</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>nú</i>	<i>yám</i>	<i>sádane</i>
own:LOC.SG.N	PRT	now	REL:ACC.SG.M	seat:LOC.SG.N
<i>jaḡrbhré</i>		/	<i>prásastibhir</i>	<i>dadhiré</i>
grab:PERF.MID.3PL			laud:INS.PL.F	put:PERF.MID.3PL
<i>yajñítyāsaḥ</i>				
worthy.of.sacrifice:NOM.PL.M				

‘Whom **even** now those worthy of the sacrifice have grasped in his **very** own seat and installed with lauds’ RV 1.148.3a

Jamison & Brereton (2014: 325) construe *cid* with the following *nú* ‘now’ but its position speaks against this analysis.²⁹⁷ Instead I assume that *cid* is exclusive with local scope over the nominal expression *nītye sádane*, which can then be translated as ‘on the seat that was only his own’. This somewhat redundant construction enhances the fact that the seat belongs to nobody

²⁹⁵ ‘Als er den Dreiköpfigen, der sieben Zügel braucht, erschlagen hatte, ließ Trita die Kühe sogar des Tvaṣṭrsohnes heraus’ (Geldner); ‘Après avoir tué le (démon) tricéphale, aux sept rênes, Trita libéra les vaches, (celles) mêmes de (Viśvarūpa), fils de Tvaṣṭar’ (Renou); ‘having killed the three-headed (enemy), who required seven reins to control him, Trita drove out the cows of even that son of Tvaṣṭar’ (Velankar).

²⁹⁶ ‘Nachdem er (einen Teil) der Kühe des Tvaṣṭrsohnes Viśvarūpa heimgetrieben hatte, beseitigte er dessen drei Köpfe’ (Geldner); ‘Quand il eut ramené (au bercail la troupe) des vaches de Viśvarūpa, fils de Tvaṣṭar, (Trita, à son tour,) arracha les trois têtes (du démon)’ (Renou); ‘claiming for himself the cows of Viśvarūpa, son of Tvaṣṭar, he cut off all his three heads’ (Velankar).

²⁹⁷ I am not certain what is associated with ‘gerade’, which is probably the translation of *cid*, in the translation by Witzel & Gotō (2007: 274): ‘Den die Opferwürdigen nun gerade an seinem eigenen Sitz eingefangen haben (und) mit Lobesworten (daran) gesetzt haben’.

other than Agni.²⁹⁸ Notice also that Jamison & Brereton (2014: 325) translate *nítye sádane* as ‘his very own seat’, which according to my interpretation would serve as a means to render *cid*. An interesting case is also the following one, because here *cid* appears after a word which expresses, or at least implies, exclusiveness:

(267) <i>sá</i> DEM:NOM.SG.M		<i>na</i> 1PL.DAT		<i>stávāna</i> praise:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M		<i>ā́</i> LP
<i>bhara</i> carry:IMP.2SG	/	<i>rayīm</i> wealth:ACC.SG.M		<i>citráśravastamam</i> offering.most.brilliant.fame:ACC.SG.M		/
<i>nireké</i> above.all	<i>cid</i> PRT	<i>yó</i> REL:NOM.SG.M		<i>harivo</i> with.fallow.bay:VOC.SG.M		
<i>vásur</i> good:NOM.SG.M		<i>dadīḥ</i> giver:NOM.SG.M				

‘Being praised, bring here to us wealth that offers most brilliant fame—you who are exclusively the good giver, o master of the fallow bays.’ RV 8.24.3

The word *nireká-* means ‘prominence’ or ‘superiority’ (Monier-Williams 1899: 554). It can be said that someone is especially prominent (‘in prominence’) among the good givers if he is the only good giver as there are no competitors. Hence, the translation ‘exclusively’ for *nireké cid* by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1079) is justified, as is Geldner’s (1951–1957: II, 331) ‘ganz ausschließlic’. Note that it is not entirely clear that the relative clause is dependent on Indra, the addressee of the hymn, but it might also depend on *rayīm* ‘wealth’ (Geldner 1889: 156; Oldenberg 1909–1912: II, 96f.).

The following passage exhibits a special employment of exclusive *cid*. Here, I assume that exclusive *cid* is used to disambiguate a disjunction expressed by multiple *vā* ‘or’, which can be understood as inclusive or as exclusive:

(268) <i>índra</i> Indra:VOC.SG.M		<i>píba</i> drink:IMP.2SG		<i>svadháyā</i> own.power:INS.SG.F		<i>cit</i> PRT
<i>sutásya</i> pressed:GEN.SG.M	/	<i>agnér</i> Agni:GEN.SG.M		<i>vā</i> or		<i>pāhi</i> drink:AOR.IMP.2SG
<i>jihváyā</i> tongue:INS.SG.F		<i>yajatra</i> worthy.of.sacrifice:VOC.SG.M		/		<i>adhvaryór</i> Adhvaryu:GEN.SG.M
<i>práyataṃ</i> LP.hold:PPP.ACC.SG.M		<i>śakra</i> strong:VOC.SG.M		<i>hástād</i> hand:ABL.SG.M	/	<i>dhótur</i> Hotar:GEN.SG.M
<i>vā</i> or		<i>yajñám</i> sacrifice:ACC.SG.M		<i>havíšo</i> oblation:GEN.SG.N		<i>juṣasva</i> enjoy:AOR.IMP.MID.2SG

²⁹⁸ Maybe this interpretation is reflected in the translation ‘in his very own seat’ by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 325). This would mean that they assume a twofold function of *cid*.

‘Indra, drink of the pressed (soma) **just** by your own power or take a drink with the tongue of Agni, o you who deserve the sacrifice. Either from the hand of the Adhvaryu or from the oblation of the Hotar enjoy the offered sacrifice, able one.’ RV 3.35.10

In English, a disjunction of the form *A or B* can be understood as inclusive (*A or B or both*) or as exclusive (*either A or B*). That a disjunction of the form *A vā ... B vā* can be understood as inclusive in Vedic is shown by the following example:

(269) <i>eténāgne</i>			<i>bráhmanā</i>		<i>vāvṛdhasva</i>	/
DEM:INS.SG.N+Agni:VOC.SG.M			formulation:INS.SG.N		grow:PERF.IMP.MID.2SG	
<i>śáktī</i>	vā	<i>yát</i>	<i>te</i>		<i>cakṛmā</i>	
skill:INS.SG.F	or	REL:ACC.SG.N	2SG.DAT		do:PERF.1PL	
<i>vidā́</i>	vā					
knowledge:INS.SG.F	or					

‘Through this sacred formulation, o Agni, keep growing strong—the one that we have made for you by skill **or** by knowledge.’ RV 1.31.18ab

In this passage, the poet probably does not want to express that the sacred formulation was made by either skill or knowledge, but that possibly it was made by both. Hence, Griffith (1896–1897: I, 42) even translates the instrumentals in pāda b as conjoined instead of disjoined: ‘prayer made by us after our power and knowledge’. The disjunction in the first hemistich in ex. (268) is of a different nature. In the first disjunct, *svadháyā* ‘by your own power’ is marked by the exclusive particle *cid*. This means that Indra is invited to drink the soma by his own power and by nothing else. In the second disjunct, Indra is invited to drink the soma with the tongue of Agni, i.e. with something other than his own power. Consequently, Indra cannot accept both invitations so that the disjunction is exclusive. I therefore assume that *cid* is used here to explicitly mark the disjunction as exclusive. The disjunction in the second hemistich, where *cid* is not present, is ambiguous.²⁹⁹ As is shown in the example, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 518) appear to interpret it as exclusive. Grassmann’s (1876–1877: I, 83), in contrast, treats the two pādas as though they were conjoined rather than disjoined.³⁰⁰ Even though I regard the construction as a disjunction, Grassman’s translation shows that it is also plausible to assume the truth of both disjuncts. Hence, the disjunction can also be interpreted as inclusive.

Like additive particles, exclusive particles can have a scalar and a non-scalar reading. Scalar exclusive particles mark their foci as lower on the respective scale than their alternatives

²⁹⁹ Geldner and Renou assume a different structure of the stanza. They assume a closer unit between pādas a–c: ‘Indra! Trink nach eignem Ermessen vom Soma oder trink mit der Zunge des Agni, du Opferwürdiger, oder aus der Hand des Adhvaryu den dargebotenen, du Mächtiger, oder erfreue dich an dem Weispruch des Hotṛ zur Opferspende!’ (Geldner 1951–1957: I, 377); ‘O Indra, bois en (toute) autonomie ou bien par (l’intermédiaire) de la langue d’Agni, ô (dieu) adorable, / ou bien (le soma) offert de la main de l’officiant-manuel, ô (dieu) puissant, ou (enfin) prends plaisir au sacrifice du hotar, à (son) oblation!’ (Renou 1955–1969: XVII, 78). I follow Jamison & Brereton (2014: 518).

³⁰⁰ ‘Geniess, o Starker, das gereichte Opfer aus Dieners Hand und aus dem Guss des Priesters’.

(König 1991: 99–101; Nevalainen 1991: 59–64). One case in which I consider a scalar exclusive function of *cid* the most plausible interpretation is the following one:

(270) <i>śrutām</i>		<i>gāyatrām</i>		<i>tākavānasya</i>	/
hear:AOR.IMP.2DU		song:ACC.SG.M		Takavāna:GEN.SG.M	
<i>ahām</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhī</i>	<i>rirébhāśvinā</i>		<i>vām</i>
1SG.NOM	PRT	for	rasp:PERF.1SG+Aśvin:VOC.DU.M		2DU.ACC

‘Hear the song of Takavāna, **even though** I have rasped it out to you, Aśvins.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 280)

‘Hear the song of Takavāna, for **only** I have rasped it out to you’ (my adaptation) RV 1.120.6ab

As their translation indicates, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 280) see a concessive relation between the two clauses. They (2014: 279) surmise that Takavāna, who is mentioned in pāda a, “is someone whose beautiful voice the poet hopes the Aśvins will hear instead of his own raspy one”. This might suggest that the concessive relation between the two clauses is expressed by *cid*, but in Section 4.6.2.2 I argued that *cid* alone does not function as a marker of concessive clauses. Hence, I do not believe that it does here either. Instead, I assign *cid* a scalar exclusive function, so that I translate ex. (270) as ‘Hear the song of Takavāna, although only I have rasped it out to you’. The fact that my translation nevertheless assumes a concessive relation between the two clauses needs further explication. Hettrich (1988: 176) finds some cases in which *hī* expresses a concessive relation between two clauses. One instance he gives is the following:

(271) <i>vī</i>	<i>hī</i>	<i>ákhyam</i>		<i>mānasā</i>		<i>vásya</i>
LP	for	look:AOR.1SG		mind:INS.SG.N		welfare:ACC.SG.N
<i>ichánn</i>			/	<i>indrāgnī</i>		<i>jñāsá</i>
desire:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.M				Indra.Agni:VOC.DU.M		relative:ACC.PL.M
<i>utá</i>	<i>vā</i>	<i>sajātān</i>	/	<i>nānyā</i>		<i>yuvát</i>
and	or	kinsman:ACC.PL.M		NEG+other:NOM.SG.F		2DU.ABL
<i>prámatir</i>		<i>asti</i>		<i>máhyam</i>		
providence:NOM.SG.F		be:3SG		1SG.DAT		

‘**Although** I looked around, with my soul longing for welfare and for kin or brothers, O Indra and Agni, I have no other providence but yours.’³⁰¹ RV 1.109.1a–c

Viti (2007: 185), who follows Hettrich’s analysis, remarks that this function of *hī* is only observable in the younger portions of the Rigveda. Ex. (270) is also from the first book so that this is not a problem. The concessive relation in ex. (270) is in accordance with the presence of the scalar exclusive particle *cid*: On the scale of people who sing beautifully, Takavāna assumes a high point whereas the poet assumes a low point. Hence, the circumstance that the poet sings is unfavorable for the request to hear a song as beautiful as that of Takavāna. Nonetheless, a

³⁰¹ The translation is adopted from Viti (2007: 185).

concessive interpretation of *hí* is not certain. In ex. (271), Jamison & Brereton (2014: 256) interpret it causally and translate ‘Because, seeking a better state, I have surveyed with my mind my kith and kin, o Indra and Agni, there exists for me no other (fatherly) solicitude than you two’. However, I suggest that ex. (270) is also plausible if one assigns *hí* its usual causal meaning. This results in the following translation: ‘Hear the song of Takavāna, for only I have rasped it out to you’. At first sight, the causal interpretation seems somewhat paradoxical. However, this is less so if one follows the interpretation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 279), namely that the poet “asks the Ásvins to hear his song **as if** it were the song that Takavāna sings” (my emphasis). Pāda b then gives the reason why the poet has this request. The poet’s voice is raspy and he believes that because of this, the Ásvins will never listen to his calls. The example can therefore be paraphrased as ‘Please pretend that you hear the song of Takavāna, for I am afraid that you will never listen to my inferior song’. Just as with the concessive interpretation of *hí*, this would be in accordance with a scalar exclusive function of *cid*.

According to my interpretation, ex. (270) is one of the typical cases where the scalar particle excludes all alternatives that are higher on the scale than its focus. Following König (1991: 101–107) and Nevalainen (1991: 64), there are also cases in which such particles exclude all lower alternatives, i.e. contexts where the scale is reversed. Possibly, the following example exhibits such a behavior:

(272) <i>ádhā</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>viṣṇo</i>	<i>vidúṣā</i>	<i>cid</i>	
then	2SG.DAT	Viṣṇu:VOC.SG.M	know:PTCP.PERF.ACT.INS.SG.M	PRT	
<i>árdhiya</i>		/	<i>stómo</i>	<i>yajñás</i>	<i>ca</i>
to.be.accomplished:NOM.SG.M			praise:NOM.SG.M	sacrifice:NOM.SG.M	and
<i>rádhīyo</i>		<i>havíṣmatā</i>			
to.be.performed:NOM.SG.M		with.oblation:INS.SG.M			

‘Then for you, o Viṣṇu, praise can be brought to success **only** by one who knows, and sacrifice can be made to succeed by one who offers an oblation.’ RV 1.156.1cd

The interpretation of *cid* in this passage is not entirely clear. Renou (1955–1969: XV, 38) leaves *cid* untranslated.³⁰² Griffith (1896–1897: I, 208) translates pāda c as ‘So, Viṣṇu, e’en the wise must swell thy song of praise’, which suggests that *cid* is a scalar additive particle. In contrast, as the translation in ex. (272) shows, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 333) interpret it as an exclusive particle. Similarly also Geldner (1951–1957: I, 214), albeit with a different syntactic interpretation.³⁰³ The difference in the interpretation of *cid* results from the different

³⁰² ‘Alors, ô Viṣṇu, (il y aura) pour toi, (fait) par (l’homme) qui sait, un corps-de-louange propre à réussir et un sacrifice propre (aussi) à réussir, (fait) par (l’homme) porteur d’offrandes’.

³⁰³ ‘Dann soll dir, Viṣṇu, ein Loblied, wie es nur der Kundige richtig treffen kann, und ein Opfer von dem Opferspender zur Zufriedenheit gemacht werden’.

interpretations of the predicate *árdhyas*. In his free translation, Griffith renders it as ‘must swell’, so that literally it would be translated as ‘must be swollen’. Here, ‘the wise’ is an unlikely alternative. Jamison & Brereton translate it as ‘can be brought to success’. Here, an interpretation of *cid* as ‘even’ does not make sense, because someone who knows appears to be suitable to bring the praise to success. Instead it is plausible to assume that alternatives to ‘one who knows’ are excluded here. As in this interpretation being the one who knows is a sufficient condition for being able to bring the praise to success and because the clause constitutes a general statement, this is a context where the scale evoked by the exclusive particle can be reversed (König 1991: 101–107). Thus, in this interpretation *cid* excludes all alternatives that are lower on the scale than *vidúṣā* ‘by the one who knows’. Witzel & Gotō (2007: 282) interpret *cid* as a non-scalar exclusive particle with local scope over *vidúṣā* ‘by one who only knows’.³⁰⁴ However, I do not find this interpretation convincing because I am not certain what ‘one who only knows’ is supposed to mean. Perhaps it means that he never has to assume anything.

As I have mentioned in the beginning of this section, *cid* does not appear only as a proper exclusive particle but also in related functions, which are also attested for *íd*. Thus, in Section 5.1 I will show that in addition to functioning as an exclusive particle, *íd* is also able to mark exhaustive focus, which is very similar to its function as an exclusive particle. Ex. (262) in the current section has already shown that also for *cid* these two functions are not easy to distinguish. In the following passage, I assume *cid* to mark exhaustive focus:

(273) <i>sáptī</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>ghā</i>	<i>madacyútā</i>	/
horse:NOM.DU.M	PRT	PRT	roused.to.exuberance:NOM.DU.M	
<i>mithunā́</i>	<i>vahato</i>	<i>rátham</i>	/	<i>evéd</i> [= <i>evá íd</i>]
pair:NOM.DU.M	pull:3DU	chariot:ACC.SG.M		SO+PRT
<i>dhūr</i>	<i>vṛ̥ṣṇa</i>	<i>úttarā</i>		
chariot.poll:NOM.SG.F	bull:GEN.SG.M	higher:NOM.SG.F		

“‘It’s the twin span, the complementary pair [/married couple], aroused to exuberance, **that** draws the chariot [=sacrifice]; but even so the chariot-pole of the bull [=husband] is higher.’”³⁰⁵ RV 8.33.18

This stanza is the continuation of Indra’s speech, who previously said that women cannot be taught and that their will is fickle. Ludwig (1876–1888: V, 158) wonders about the function of *cid*. He contemplates an additive interpretation but this does not seem to be plausible. Geldner (1951–1957: II, 347) uses the concessive particle ‘zwar’ in his translation but in Section 4.6.2 I argued that *cid* alone does not express concessivity.³⁰⁶ Instead, I consider *cid* to mark

³⁰⁴ ‘Dann ist der Lobgesang für dich, Viṣṇu, von einem, der nur weiß, zum Gelingen zu bringen, und das Opfer ist von einem mit Opfertgaben zum Erfolg zu bringen’.

³⁰⁵ The translation of pāda a deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1098).

³⁰⁶ ‘Zwar zieht ein hochtrabendes Rossepaar den Wagen; doch überragt das Deichseljoch den (Zug)stier’.

exhaustive focus, which is in accordance with the translation as a cleft-sentence by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1098). Based on Jamison (comm.VIII.1: ad loc.), I assume that there is a conflict between pādas a/b and pāda c in that the first hemistich raises the expectation that the two animals that draw the chariot are equal whereas pāda c expresses that they are of different height. I will discuss this passage again as ex. (383) in Section 5.2, where I will argue that this conflict explains the presence of *íd* in pāda c, because it emphatically marks the identity of *evá* with what is said in the first hemistich. I assume that the alternative to the focus of *cid* is ‘the bull’, i.e. the husband. The employment of *cid* expresses that it is the couple instead of only the bull/husband that draws the chariot. This further contributes to the conflict that exists between the first hemistich and pāda c.³⁰⁷ In the following example, *cid* has been interpreted as a scalar additive particle but I suggest that an interpretation as a marker of exhaustive focus is more advantageous:

(274) <i>pūrvís</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>tvé</i>	<i>tuvikūrmin</i>	<i>āsáso</i>	/
many:NOM.PL.F	PRT	for	2SG.LOC	powerful:VOC.SG.M	hope:NOM.PL.F	
<i>hávanta</i>		<i>indra</i>		<i>ūtáyaḥ</i>	/	<i>tiráś</i>
call:INJ.MID.3SG		Indra:VOC.SG.M		help:NOM.PL.F	LP	<i>cid</i>
						PRT
<i>aryáḥ</i>		<i>sávanā</i>		<i>vaso</i>		
stranger:GEN.SG.M		pressing:ACC.PL.N+LP		good:VOC.SG.M		
<i>gahi</i>						
go:AOR.IMP.2SG						

‘For although many are the hopes that call to you, powerfully ranging Indra, and many are your forms of help, pass over the pressings of the stranger, good one.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1155)

‘... Come here, you good one, **even** past the pressings of a lord!’³⁰⁸

‘For very many are the hopes that call to you, powerfully ranging Indra, and very many are your forms of help. Go **PAST** the pressings of the stranger, good one.’ (my adaptation) RV 8.66.12a–c

I have already discussed this passage as ex. (231) in Section 4.6.2.2, where I argued that *cid* in pāda a is a degree modifier rather than a marker of concessivity (cf. Section 4.5). I am now concerned with the *cid* in pāda c. Geldner (1951–1957: II, 389) translates *cid* as an additive particle. Due to its position, I assume that the focus of *cid* is *tiráś aryás sávanā* ‘past the pressings of a lord’ in this interpretation. In Geldner’s translation this is plausible because it seems less likely that Indra goes past the pressing of a lord than e.g. across plain fields. However, according to Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1155) the lexeme *arí-* denotes a stranger

³⁰⁷ I am not certain how *cid* interacts with the particle *gha*, which follows it.

³⁰⁸ The translation follows Geldner (1951–1957: II, 389): ‘Komm her, du Guter, sogar an eines hohen Herren Trankopfern vorüber!’.

and not a lord. Casaretto (2011: 193) shares this interpretation of *arí-* but nonetheless renders *cid* as a scalar additive particle.³⁰⁹ Due to the fact that the first hemistich states that Indra is called by many and that he is also helpful, it is justified to assume that ‘past the pressings of a stranger’ is still an unlikely alternative. Nevertheless, I propose a different interpretation, namely that *cid* marks exhaustive focus. As I have just mentioned, in the first hemistich it is said that Indra is helpful and that he is called by many. This causes the implicit assumption that Indra goes towards many people, who are strangers to the poet, in order to help them. I therefore conclude that in pāda c the poet requests that Indra go past these strangers instead of towards them. This means that there is narrow exhaustive focus on the local particle *tiráś*. In English, this function of *cid* can best be translated by stressing the preposition (cf. Umbach 2004: 164–166). Even though I do not want to exclude the scalar additive interpretation of *cid* I find the exhaustive one more advantageous because it makes clearer than the additive one that the poet wants Indra to ignore the other sacrificers. Compare ex. (156) in Section 4.4.1, where the poet asks Indra to listen only to him and his associates although many people vie in invoking Indra. A similar passage to ex. (274) is RV 4.29.1. A further passage where *cid* probably expresses exhaustive focus is ex. (292) in Section 4.9.

In addition to marking exhaustive focus, I also assume that *cid*, similarly to *íd* in ex. (383) in Section 5.2, can be used as an emphasizer, i.e. to emphatically assert the identity of two referents, as the following example shows:

(275) <i>ayám</i> DEM:NOM.SG.M		<i>pánthā</i> path:NOM.SG.M		<i>ánuvittaḥ</i> LP.find:PPP.NOM.SG.M	
<i>purāṇó</i> ancient:NOM.SG.M	/	<i>yáto</i> from.where		<i>devā́</i> god:NOM.PL.M	<i>udájāyanta</i> LP.be.born:IPRF.MID.3PL
<i>viśve</i> all:NOM.PL.M	/	<i>átaś</i> from.there		<i>cid</i> <i>á</i> PRT LP	<i>janiṣīṣta</i> be.born:AOR.OPT.MID.3SG
<i>právrddho</i> LP.grow:PPP.NOM.SG.M					

‘[Indra’s Mother:] This is the ancient, proven path by which all the gods were born and moved upward. By this **very** path he should be born when he has grown great.’ (Doniger O’Flaherty 1981: 142) RV 4.18.1a–c

Here, Indra’s mother emphasizes that the path from which Indra should be born is the same as the one from which the gods are born. I consider this interpretation by Doniger O’Flaherty (1981: 142) more plausible than the one by Geldner (1951–1957: I, 441), who interprets *cid* as an additive particle the focus of which is the null subject ‘he’ or the one by Grassmann (1876–

³⁰⁹ ‘Komm herbei, du Guter, sogar an den Trankopfern eines Fremdlings vorbei!’

1877: I, 125), who regards *právrddhas* ‘full-grown’ as the subject and the focus of *cid*.³¹⁰ Schnaus (2008: 109) merely indicates an emphatic function of *cid* by typing the translation of *átas* in boldface.³¹¹ I do not consider the translation ‘wenn überhaupt’ by Witzel et al. (2013: 147) to be plausible (cp. also ex. (97) in Section 4.2).³¹² Similarly to ex. (275), *cid* may be rendered as ‘precisely’ in the following example. It emphasizes the identity of the moment of utterance:

(276) <i>yád</i>	<i>ádhrigāvo</i>	<i>ádhrigū</i>	/	<i>idā́</i>	<i>cid</i>
when	Adhriḡu:NOM.PL.M	Adhriḡu:ACC.DU.M		now	PRT
<i>áhno</i>	<i>aśvínā</i>	<i>hávāmahe</i>	/	<i>vayám</i>	
day:GEN.SG.N	Aśvin:ACC.DU.M	call:MID.1PL		1PL.NOM	
<i>gīrbhír</i>	<i>vipanyávaḥ</i>				
hymn:INS.PL.F	praising:NOM.PL.M				

‘When we Adhriḡus call upon the Aśvins, the two Adhriḡu [/who are not poor], at this **very** time of day—we expressing admiration with our hymns—’ RV 8.22.11

In the following passage, *cid* co-occurs with the particle *u* after an anaphorically used demonstrative pronoun:

(277) <i>vṛṣā́</i>	<i>jajāna</i>	<i>vṛṣaṇam</i>	<i>ráṇāya</i>	/
bull:NOM.SG.M	give.birth:PERF.3SG	bull.ACC.SG.M	battle:DAT.SG.M	
<i>tám</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>nārī</i>	<i>náriyam</i>
DEM:ACC.SG.M	PRT	PRT	woman:NOM.SG.F	manly:ACC.SG.M
<i>sasūva</i>				
bear:PERF.3SG				

‘The bull begat the bull for battle; that manly one did a woman bear.’ RV 7.20.5ab

As I have outlined in Section 4.3.2, Klein (2016) labels the function of this particle in anaphoric sequences as “identity focus”, which appears to be an equivalent of the notion of emphatic assertion of identity, which I use (cf. also Section 4.2).³¹³ As it co-occurs with a particle which such a function and because of the context, it is unlikely that *cid* has additive function here.³¹⁴ Instead, I assume that *cid* is also employed as an identifier in order to increase the emphasis. As with the exclusive function of *cid*, emphatic assertion of identity is not easy to distinguish from exhaustive focus (cf. König 1991: 129). Thus, in ex. (275) *cid* might express that it is the aforementioned path instead of some other path by which Agni should be born. Likewise, in

³¹⁰ ‘Dies ist der erprobte alte Weg, auf dem alle Götter geboren wurden. Auf diesem soll auch er ausgereift geboren werden’ (Geldner); ‘Auf dem entspringe auch der ausgewachsne’ (Grassmann). Jamison & Brereton (2014: 586) appear to interpret *cid* as exclusive rather than as an identifier: ‘Just from it should he be born full-grown’.

³¹¹ ‘Auf **dem** soll er geboren werden als Ausgewachsener!’

³¹² ‘Hier ist der befolgte alte Weg, aus dem heraus die Götter alle geboren wurden. Von hierher, wenn überhaupt, möge er, der schon ausgewachsene, geboren werden’.

³¹³ See Velankar’s (1963b: 57) translation: ‘the brave woman, (the mother), bore forth that same manly son’.

³¹⁴ Ludwig (1876–1888: II, 156) appears to assume a different focus for additive *cid*: ‘der stierkräftige brachte hervor den stierstarken zur kampfesfreude, auch hat ihn die frau als menschenfreundlichen gezeugt’.

ex. (276) it might express that it is this time of the day instead of some other time. Accordingly, in ex. (277), *u* and *cid* may fulfill different functions in that *cid* marks exhaustive focus and *u* emphasizes that the focus is identical with a referent of a nominal expression in the previous clause. One might then translate ‘it was precisely that manly one that a woman bore’.

One group of text passages in which *cid* appears to share another function with *íd* are those in which *cid* follows the subordinating conjunction *yáthā* ‘like’. The collocation *yáthā cid* occurs 9 times in the Rigveda. In two of these, it can be interpreted as expressing universal or free-choice concessive conditionals (see Section 4.6.2.1). In the other cases, *yáthā* is the translational equivalent of ‘like, as’. Consider the following examples:

(278) <i>yáthā</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>vr̥ddhám</i>		<i>atasám</i>	/	<i>ágne</i>
like	PRT	grow:PPP.ACC.SG.N		bush:ACC.SG.N		Agni:VOC.SG.M
<i>saṃjūrvasi</i>		<i>kṣámi</i>	/	<i>evā́</i>	<i>daha</i>	<i>mitramaho</i>
LP.singe:2SG		ground:LOC.SG.F		so	burn:IMP.2SG	rich.in.friends:VOC.SG.M
<i>yó</i>		<i>asmadhrúg</i>	/	<i>durmánmā</i>		
REL:NOM.SG.M		hating.us:NOM.SG.M		ill.intentioned:NOM.SG.M		
<i>kás</i>		<i>ca</i>	<i>vénati</i>			
who:NOM.SG.M		and	stalk:3SG			

‘Just as you incinerate the brushwood grown thick on the ground, o Agni, in the same way burn whoever stalks (us), lying to us and ill-intentioned, o you who deploy the might of alliance.’ RV 8.60.7

(279) <i>á</i>	<i>sá</i>		<i>etu</i>	<i>yá</i>		<i>ívad</i>
LP	DEM:NOM.SG.M		go:IMP.3SG	REL:NOM.SG.M		so.large:ACC.SG.N
<i>ám̐</i>	/	<i>ádevaḥ</i>	<i>pūrtám</i>	<i>ādadé</i>	/	
LP		non.god:NOM.SG.M	gift:ACC.SG.N	LP.take:PERF.MID.3SG		
<i>yáthā</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>váśo</i>		<i>ásviyáḥ</i>	/	<i>ṛṥhuśrávasi</i>
like	PRT	Vaśa:NOM.SG.M		Aśvya:NOM.SG.M		Ṛṥhuśravas:LOC.PL.M
<i>kānīté</i>	/	<i>asyá</i>		<i>viúṣi</i>		
Kānīta:LOC.SG.M		DEM:GEN.SG.F		dawning:LOC.SG.F		
<i>ādadé</i>						
LP.take:PERF.MID.3SG						

‘Let him come here—any non-god who has taken as great a gift as Vaśa Aśvya has taken from Ṛṥhuśravas Kānita [sic] at the dawning of this (dawn) here.’ RV 8.46.21

According to Grassmann (1873: 455), *yáthā cid* can be used to express that the event in its clause is habitual or repeated. Hettrich (1988: 456f.) argues that *cid* cannot have generalizing function after *yáthā*. Cases like ex. (278) may allow for such a reading but in cases like ex. (279), which denote completed events that have taken place only once, a generalizing interpretation is not possible. As a result, Hettrich (1988: 456f.) assumes that in this collocation, *cid* has its usual emphasizing meaning and that it emphasizes the entire clause. He gives German ‘ja, gerade, nämlich’ (‘just, namely’) as possibilities to express the function of *cid* in these

clauses.³¹⁵ At least in ex. (278), Geldner (1951–1957: II, 381) treats *cid* as a focus particle, whose focus follows it.³¹⁶ In ex. (279), he (1951–1957: II, 365) apparently leaves it untranslated.³¹⁷ Jamison & Brereton (2014) render *cid* in 6 out of the 9 times that *yáthā cid* occurs as ‘just’.³¹⁸ Renou’s (1955–1969: XIII, 75) translation of ex. (278) is in accordance with this,³¹⁹ but in the comment on this passage he remarks that he interprets *cid* as if it occurred after *vṛddhám* ‘grown’, which means that he interprets *cid* in the same way as Geldner. Nevertheless, I believe that the interpretation by Jamison & Brereton is the most plausible. In Section 5.3, I will argue that *íd* has an intensificatory function when it occurs with the particles *iva* and *ná* ‘like’, which mark comparisons. This means it indicates that on a similarity scale the compared elements assume a point that is close to absolute identity. According to Lee (1991: 56), this is the function that English *just* has with comparisons and I assume it also for *cid*. In ex. (278) *yáthā cid* expresses that the incineration of the enemy should be exactly like, i.e. close to identical to, the incineration of the brushwood. Ex. (279) is a little different because here *ívad* ‘such a great (gift)’, which itself is the object of a relative clause, is the correlative element of *yáthā*. In this case, *cid* emphasizes that the quality of the gift has to be identical to the quality of the gift that Vaśa Aśvya has taken. If this interpretation is correct, the function of *cid* after *yáthā* is comparable to that of *íd* after or before the comparative particles *iva* ‘like’ and *ná* ‘like’, respectively. There is one passage in the Rigveda in which *cid* precedes the comparative particle *ná*, namely the following:

(280) <i>átāpi</i> heat:AOR.PASS.3SG	<i>gharmó</i> hot.milk:NOM.SG.M	<i>mánuṣo</i> Manu:GEN.SG.M	<i>duroné</i> house:LOC.SG.N	/
<i>yó</i> REL:NOM.SG.M	<i>vāṃ</i> 2DU.ACC	<i>samudrān</i> sea:ACC.PL.M	<i>sarítaḥ</i> river:ACC.PL.F	<i>píparti</i> / carry:3SG
<i>étagvā</i> swift:NOM.DU.M	<i>cin</i> PRT	<i>ná</i> like	<i>suyújā</i> well.harnessed:NOM.DU.M	
<i>yujānáḥ</i> harness:PTCP.AOR.MID.NOM.SG.M				

‘In the house of Manu has been heated the hot milk that carries you, having been harnessed like a pair of well-harnessed swift steeds, across the seas and rivers’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 971)

³¹⁵ The German modal particle *ja* cannot be easily translated into English.

³¹⁶ ‘Wie du, Agni, auch das großgewordene Gestrüpp auf dem Erdboden verbrennst, so versenge du, wie Mitra Geehrter, jeden, der uns übel will, der in böser Absicht scheel sieht’.

³¹⁷ ‘Der Nichtgott soll noch kommen, der eine solche Schenkung bekommen hat, wie sie Vaśa Aśvya bei Prthuśravas, dem Kanītasohne, bei Anbruch dieses (Morgens) bekommen hat’. Does Geldner want to express emphasis on Vaśa Aśvya and is this related to *cid*?

³¹⁸ This includes ex. (215), where I consider a reading as ‘free choice’ conditional possible.

³¹⁹ ‘De même que tu consumes, ô Agni, la broussaille qui a crû sur la terre, / ainsi brûle, ô (dieu) grand comme Mitra, celui qui, voulant nous (faire) tort, ayant une pensée méchante, quel qu’il soit, épie !’

‘... harnessing (your horses), which are well-harnessed like **even** the sun-horses (are)’³²⁰
RV 7.70.2b–d

Considering the interpretation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 971) one can assume that *cid* has the same intensificatory function when it precedes *ná* as when it follows *yáthā*, so that one might translate ‘just like a pair of well-harnessed swift steeds’. However, Geldner (1951–1957: II, 245) interprets *pāda d* differently. He identifies *étagvā* with the sun-horses, which justifies the interpretation of *cid* as a scalar additive particle. For it is less likely that the horses that are harnessed by the hot milk are harnessed as well as the sun horses than that they are harnessed as well as other horses. Since this is the only passage in which *cid* occurs with comparative *ná*, I conclude that there is a complementary distribution between intensificatory *cid* and *íd* with respect to comparisons: *cid* occurs after *yáthā* whereas *íd* occurs after *iva* and before *ná*.

As with *íd* and English *just*, the intensificatory use of *cid* is not restricted to comparisons. In the following text passage, which praises food, it occurs with a goal:

(281) <i>yád</i>	<i>adó</i>		<i>pito</i>		<i>ájagan</i>	/	<i>vivásva</i>
when	DEM.NOM.SG.N		food:VOC.SG.M		go:PLUPRF.3SG		light:NOM.SG.N
<i>párvatānām</i>		/	<i>átrā</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>no</i>		<i>madho</i>
mountain:GEN.SG.M			here	PRT	1PL.ACC		sweet:VOC.SG.M
<i>pito</i>		/	<i>áram</i>	<i>bhaksāya</i>			<i>gamiyāḥ</i>
food:VOC.SG.M			fit	portion:DAT.SG.M			go:AOR.OPT.2SG

‘When yonder dawning light of the mountains has come, o food, then you should **also** come here to us, honeyed food, fit for our portion.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 392)

‘... then you should come **right** here to us ...’ (my adaptation) RV 1.187.7

I assume that in the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 392), ‘also’ is to be stressed and that they regard ‘you’ as the focus of this particle. I do not follow this interpretation because this would mean that the focus of *cid* is a null pronoun and not the preceding word. Instead, I propose an intensificatory function for *cid*. Like a similarity scale, the concept ‘here to us’ has one clear boundary, namely physical contact with the referents of ‘us’, i.e. the addressee cannot come any closer; in contrast, it is not clearly defined when the addressee arrives at a place that cannot be referred by ‘here to us’ anymore (cf. Lee 1991: 55f.). I believe that *cid* indicates proximity to the clear upper boundary of the semantic range of ‘here to us’, which is the function that Lee (1991: 55f.) assumes for English *just* and I assume for Vedic *íd* in Section 5.3.

A function of English *just* that is similar to the intensificatory one described above is “to identify or specify the marginal phase” (Lee 1987: 389). As an example Lee (1991: 55–57)

³²⁰ The translation is based on Geldner (1951–1957: II, 245): ‘der Gharmatrank ist in der Wohnung des Menschen heiß gemacht worden, der euch über die Meere, die Flüsse hinüberbringt, indem er (eure Rosse) anschirrt, die so gut geschirrt sind wie selbst die Sonnenrosse’.

gives the sentence *He left just before midnight*. He explains that here as well, the concept *before midnight* has one clear boundary, which is midnight, and *just* identifies close proximity to this boundary, but in contrast to the intensificatory reading “the relevant truth conditions are on the verge of inapplicability”: If the person had left only a little bit later, the sentence would not be true anymore, but one would have to say *He left at midnight* or *He left after midnight*. A passage where Vedic *cid* possibly has such a specificatory function is the following one from a hymn dedicated to soma:

(282) <i>suté</i>	<i>cit</i>	<i>tvā</i>	<i>apsú</i>	<i>madāmo</i>
press:PPP.LOC.SG.M	PRT	2SG.ACC	water:LOC.PL.F	be.drunk:1PL
<i>ándhasā</i>	/	<i>śrīñáto</i>		<i>góbhir</i>
stalk:INS.SG.N		prepare:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.PL.M		cow:INS.PL.F
<i>úttaram</i>				
higher:ACC.SG.M				

‘**Even** when (you) have **just** been pressed in the waters, we become exhilarated by your stalk, while preparing you with cows as the higher (oblation)’ RV 9.107.2cd

I assume that *cid* is used here to indicate that the poet and his associates become exhilarated immediately after the soma has been pressed into the water and not at a later time point, which is further away from the pressing. Admittedly, the boundary is not as sharp as in Lee’s example that I have given above. For midnight is a single point in time, whereas the activity of pressing is probably executed during a longer period of time. Still, one may assume that *cid* specifies the marginal phase of the time period after the pressing is finished, i.e. after the last drop of soma has entered the water. This can be regarded as a fairly clear boundary as well. The assumption that the event of becoming exhilarated takes place immediately after the soma has been pressed is also reflected in the translation by Renou (1955–1969: IX, 59).³²¹ Notice that the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1354) contains not only the particle *just* but also *even*. Interpreting *cid* as a genuine scalar additive particle is not justified in this context because ‘having been pressed’ is not an unlikely state for soma to exhilarate people. On the contrary, it is necessary. However, assuming that *cid* specifies the marginal phase, *suté cid* can in fact be interpreted as an unlikely alternative because usually when beverages are prepared some time passes before they are consumed by people. As a result, a scalar additive interpretation of *cid* arises secondarily.

The last function of *cid* that I will discuss in this section is that as a slack regulator. Slack regulators are elements that lower the tolerance for deviance or exceptions (Laserson 1999). In Section 5.4, I will argue that, among other contexts, *id* has this function when it follows

³²¹ ‘Dès qu’a eu lieu la pressée dans les eaux, nous nous enivrons du jus (sômique)’.

universal quantifiers. I find one clear text passage in which I consider *cid* to have this function.

Here, it appears after the prohibitive particle *mā́*:

(283) <i>mā́</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>anyád</i>	<i>ví</i>	<i>śamsata</i>	/	<i>sákhāyo</i>
NEG	PRT	other:ACC.SG.N	LP	praise:IMP.2PL		comrade:VOC.PL.M
<i>mā́</i>	<i>riṣaṇyata</i>	/	<i>índram</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>stotā</i>	
NEG	fail:INJ.2PL		Indra:ACC.SG.M	PRT	praise:IMP.2PL	
<i>vṛ́ṣaṇam</i>	<i>sácā</i>	<i>suté</i>				
bull:ACC.SG.M	together	press:PPP:LOC.SG.M				

‘Don’t praise anything else! Comrades, don’t do yourselves harm. Praise only Indra the bull when (the soma) is pressed’ RV 8.1.1a–c

Dunkel (2014: 449) translates *mā́ cid* into German as an emphatic negation ‘bloß nicht’. Similarly, Hoffmann (1967: 83) translates pāda a as ‘Rezitiert ja nichts anderes (mehr)!’. According to Grassmann (1873: 455), *cid* has a generalizing function in these cases, i.e. it marks the event described in the clause as recurrent or habitual. Similarly, Hoffmann (1967: 83) assumes that pāda a is intended to prevent that the addressees recite (or praise) something else, which would usually be done repeatedly. However, nowhere else have I found that *cid* alone marks an action as habitual (cf. my discussion of *purā́ cid* in Section 4.4.2). I therefore assume that *cid* functions as a slack regulator here, which means that it decreases the acceptability of exceptions. Hence, *mā́ cid* might be rendered as ‘not at all’ or ‘never ever’. This analysis is supported by the presence of the exclusive particle *íd* in pāda c, which again emphasizes that Indra is the only one who is to receive praise. Notice that in pāda b *mā́* occurs without *cid*. This request appears to be less urgent and rather an inserted explanation of the first request (if you praise anything else you will harm yourselves). Even though I assume that *íd* can function as a slack regulator I do not find this function combined with negation. The Rigveda does contain 4 passages where *íd* follows the negative particle *ná* but the collocation *néd* (= *ná íd*) functions only as a subordinating conjunction meaning ‘lest’ (Hettrich 1988: 169–171). Hence, as with the intensificatory function with comparisons the Rigveda appears to exhibit a complementary distribution of *íd* and *cid* in the function of a slack regulator. Notice, however, that in Section 4.4 I have also found cases where *cid* appears after universal quantifiers. I consider *cid* to have a totalizing function in these passages, but this function cannot be easily distinguished from the use of *íd* as a slack regulator in these contexts.

In this section, I have shown that besides being an additive particle, *cid* is also employed as an exclusive particle and in related functions. That a focus operator can synchronically have both additive and exclusive function may be unusual, but it is not unparalleled typologically. For instance, both functions are also attested for Old Italian *pur(e)* (Ricca 2017), for Korean *-na* (Kim 2015) or for *ʔut* in the Central Salish language *ʔayʔajuθəm* (Huijsmans 2019).

According to Ricca (2017: 54–57), one of the bridging contexts in which scalar operators may obtain this dual function is in a context that expresses a sufficient condition and where the scale of additives is reversed, as in ex. (57) in Section 4.1.³²² There, the focus of both additives and exclusives is on the low end of a scale. Further contexts that she (2017: 56f.) mentions are where an ambiguity of the function is the result of scope ambiguity. The following Rigvedic example shows such a context in which both a scalar additive and a scalar exclusive interpretation are possible:

(284) <i>dabhrébhíś</i>	<i>cic</i>	<i>chásīyāṃsaṃ</i>	/	<i>hāṃsi</i>
few:INS.PL.M	PRT	more.numerous:ACC.SG.M		hit:2SG
<i>vrādhantam</i>		<i>ójasā</i>	/	<i>sákhibir</i>
be:great:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.SG.M		power:INS.SG.N		comrade:INS.PL.M
<i>yé</i>	<i>tuvé</i>	<i>sácā</i>		
REL:NOM.PL.M	2SG.LOC	LP		

‘With **only** a few you smash the more numerous overweening (force) with your power, with the comrades who are in company with you.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 608)

‘**Even** with the weak thou smitest down him who is stronger, with thy strength The mighty, with the Friends thou hast.’ (Griffith 1896–1897: I, 435) RV 4.32.3

According to the analysis of such cases by König (1991: 104f.; 170), these different translations result from a different interpretation of the scope of the particle. In the interpretation by Griffith, the scope of *cid* extends over the entire clause. Here, *dabhrébhíś* ‘with a few’ is an unlikely alternative because it is unexpected that a strong enemy is vanquished with a few comrades. In the interpretation by Jamison & Brereton, the scope of *cid* contains only the expression *dabhrébhíś*, given that pāda c constitutes an afterthought. Here, ‘a few’ is ranked low on a scale of numbers of comrades. In the English translation, the local scope is marked by the position of ‘only’ within the prepositional phrase (cf. Taglicht 1984: 153–155). I will argue in Section 4.10 that when *cid* occurs in the second position of the clause, its scope may contain the entire clause or a smaller portion. This means that ex. (284) is ambiguous. Notice that in the exclusive interpretation of *cid* in ex. (272), the exclusive particle takes scope over the entire clause so that there additive and exclusive functions are not neutralized. A further case that is similar to ex. (284) is the following passage.

(285) <i>sadyás</i>	<i>cit</i>	<i>tám</i>	<i>abhíṣṭaye</i>	/	<i>káro</i>
in.one.day	PRT	DEM:ACC.SG.M	prevailing:DAT.SG.F		do:AOR.SBJV.2SG
<i>vásás</i>	<i>ca</i>	<i>vājīnam</i>			
wish:SBJV.2SG	and	prizewinner:ACC.SG.M			

³²² Notice that unlike *cid*, Old Italian *pur(e)* is attested more often as an exclusive than an additive operator. In Modern Italian the exclusive use is rather exceptional. Therefore, Ricca (2017: 50) assumes a development from an exclusive to an additive operator.

‘**just** in a single day you will make it to prevail as a prizewinner if you so desire.’ RV 1.129.1de

As in the previous example, the interpretation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 297) requires *cid* to take scope only over *sadyás* ‘in a single day’. However, it is also possible that the entire clause is in its scope, which would yield the translation ‘even in a single day you will make it to prevail as a prizewinner’.³²³ Notice that the interpretation of *cid* after *sadyás* can be difficult.

For aside from ‘in a single day’ it can also mean ‘at once’, as in the following passage:

(286) *vayám* *hí* *te* *cakṛmā* *bhūri*
 1SG.NOM for 2SG.DAT do:PERF.1PL much:ACC.SG.N

dāvāne / *sadyás* ***cin*** *māhi* *dāvāne*
 give:INF.DAT.SG at.once PRT great:ACC.SG.N give:INF.DAT.SG
 ‘For we have performed (a sacrifice) for you, for you to give much, to give greatly **all** at once.’ RV 8.46.25cd

Unlike in ex. (285), the English translation suggests that *cid* cannot be interpreted as a scalar exclusive particle.³²⁴ In contrast, a scalar additive reading may be possible ‘to give greatly even at once (and not only over a longer period of time, which would take longer for us to receive the goods). That *sadyás* constitutes a high point on a scale is also reflected in the translation by (Ludwig 1876–1888: II, 208).³²⁵ However, it is also possible that *cid* functions as a slack regulator that is used to emphasize that not more than a single moment passes during the process of giving. This is reflected in the translation ‘all at once’ by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1125), which also expresses that not a single gift is received later than the others. A very interesting case is the following example:

(287) *vájrasya* *yát* *te* *nīhatasya* *śúsmāt* /
 mace:GEN.SG.M when 2SG.GEN LP.hit:PPP.GEN.SG.M blast:ABL.SG.M

svanác ***cid*** *indra* *paramó*
 sound:ABL.SG.M PRT Indra:VOC.SG.M farthest:NOM.SG.M

dadāra
 burst:PERF.3SG

‘when from the blast of your mace when it was smashed down, from **just** its sound, their farthest (division) shattered, Indra.’ RV 6.27.4cd

This example resembles exx. (284) or (285) in which *cid* can have either local or clausal scope. However, there is a crucial difference between them because ex. (287) contains a factual context. König (1991: 102–105) explains that the difference between scalar additive and

³²³ Cf. Witzel & Gotō (2007: 239), who translate *sadyás* differently: ‘(so) sollst du ihn sogar sofort zur Unterstützung, wenn du willst, zum Preisgewinner machen’.

³²⁴ An exclusive interpretation of *cid* is, however, possible if one assigns *sadyás* the literal meaning ‘within an extremely short period of time’.

³²⁵ ‘dasz sogleich gar du groszes gäbest’.

exclusive particles can only be neutralized in sufficient conditions, i.e. in non-factual contexts. Therefore, Ricca (2017: 54–57) assumes only non-factual contexts as bridging contexts for a semantic change. Notice furthermore that in ex. (287) *svanāc cid* appears to be a parenthetical comment which is outside the clause. This means that the only overt element that can occur within its scope is *svanāc*.

Contexts like exx. (284) or (285) may explain why *cid* has developed both an additive and an exclusive function. What remains unclear, however, is the question of how the other functions described in this section have developed. I will argue in Section 5.12 that all the functions that I have described for *cid* in the current section are somehow related to the concept of exclusion. This suggests that the proper exclusive function was the first to have developed due to bridging contexts like the ones given above and that the other functions have developed only after the exclusive one was established. However, based on the Rigvedic data I am not able to give an account of the diachronic development of *cid* so that I will leave this question open at this point. Yet, I hope to have shown that it is plausible to assume the range of functions that I have described in this section for a particle that also has additive function.

In this section I have described the functions of *cid* that I have also identified for *íd*. I have shown that as an exclusive particle, *cid* occurs both in scalar and in non-scalar function. As a scalar particle it can exclude alternatives that are either higher or lower on the scale than its focus, depending on the context. I have argued that the exclusive *cid* is also employed to distinguish inclusive from exclusive disjunction. In addition to the exclusive function, I have discussed examples where *cid* marks exhaustive focus. As with *íd*, these two functions are not easy to distinguish. In some Rigvedic passages, I find it most plausible to assume that *cid* emphatically asserts the identity of two referents. When it is used in comparisons I assume that *cid* can have an intensificatory function when it occurs after *yáthā* ‘like’. In this function, *cid* behaves differently from *íd* in that the latter is only attested adjacent to *iva* and *ná* ‘like’ whereas intensificatory *cid* does not occur with these particles. I have also argued that the intensificatory function of *cid* is not restricted to comparisons but I have also identified this use with local expressions. Moreover, I have found a passage where it specifies the marginal phase with a temporal expression. The last function that I have identified in this section is that of a slack regulator, when *cid* occurs after the prohibitive particle *mā́*. In this function, its distribution appears to be different from that of *íd* as well. In order to explain the range of functions of *cid*, which includes both additive and exclusive use, I have given possible contexts where both an additive and an exclusive interpretation are possible. While I have not been able to give a

detailed account of the development of the different functions described in this section, I will argue in Section 5.12 that all of them are somehow related to the concept of exclusion.

4.9 *cid* as a comparative particle ‘like’

In the previous sections, I have discussed several functions that the particle *cid* has or does not have. One observation with respect to the employment of *cid* that I have not discussed yet is particularly old. For it dates back to the ancient Indian grammarian Yāska. He assigns *cid* the function of marking comparisons (Sarup 1967: 8). This view is also held by the medieval philosopher Sāyaṇa in his commentary on the Rīgveda (see e.g. Geldner 1901: 165). This would mean that *cid* has a function that is similar to that of the particles *ná* and *iva* ‘like’. The use of *ná* is illustrated by the following example (Kulikov 2021: 393):

(288) <i>śuciṣ</i>	<i>tvám</i>	<i>asi</i>	<i>priyó</i>	<i>ná</i>
shiny:NOM.SG.M	2SG.NOM	be:2SG	dear:NOM.SG.M	like
<i>mitró</i>				
Mitra:NOM.SG.M				

‘You are blazing pure, **like** dear Mitra.’ RV 1.91.3c

In the modern literature, there is discord with respect to such a function of *cid*. For instance, Renou (1952: 380) writes that *cid* rarely has such a function, although later he (1955–1969: VII, 99) skeptically remarks that an interpretation of *cid* as a comparative particle is nowhere certain. Other Grammars, for instance, that of Macdonell (1916: 230f.), do not mention this function. The same situation holds true for dictionaries and glossaries. Whereas Benfey (1852–1854: II, 115), Böhtlingk & Roth (1855–1875: II, 1026) and Geldner (1907–1909: I, 63) give this function, Grassmann (1873: 454f.) does not. In their studies of similes and comparative particles in the Rīgveda, Bergaigne (1886: 76f.), Pinault (1995–1996: 309) and most recently Kulikov (2021) and Biagetti (2021) do not mention *cid* as one of the comparative particles, whereas Sastri (1947) includes it in this group. Jamison & Brereton explicitly reject the assumption that *cid* can be used in this way on several occasions in their commentary (comm.I.1–comm.X.4)

According to my count, there are 24 cases in which Geldner (1951–1957) translates *cid* as the comparative particle ‘wie’. For reasons of space, I will not discuss all of these examples at length, but I will restrict myself to those 8 passages, which he (1907–1909: I, 63) gives for this function in his glossary, which does not comprise the entire Rīgveda.³²⁶ One of these

³²⁶ He gives RV 8.66.8 as an additional passage but he himself is uncertain about an interpretation as ‘like’.

passages contains three instances of *cid*, so that my discussion will include 10 attestations of *cid*. I will show that in none of these passages is an interpretation as a comparative particle necessary. Consider first ex. (289):

(289) <i>kumārás</i>	<i>cit</i>	<i>pitáram</i>	<i>vándamānam</i>	/
boy:NOM.SG.M	PRT	father:ACC.SG.M	praise:PTCP.PRS.MID.ACC.SG.M	
<i>práti</i>	<i>nānāma</i>	<i>rudaropayántam</i>		
LP	bow:PERF.3SG	Rudra:VOC.SG.M+LP.go:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.SG.M		

‘I bow down **like** a son before his father, Who with good will comes nigh to him, O Rudra.’ (Macdonell [n.d.]: 56)

‘**Even** a little boy bows in response to his approving father as he approaches, o Rudra.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 449) RV 2.33.12ab

In this passage, several translators render *cid* as a comparative particle, for instance Macdonell ([n.d.]: 56) as is shown in the example. Renou (1955–1969: XV, 160; 179) refers to Geldner’s glossary for the comparative function of *cid* but nevertheless he does not regard it as a genuine comparative particle and writes the French comparative marker ‘comme’ in brackets.³²⁷ However, if the simile is not marked overtly, which Jamison (comm.II: ad loc.) considers possible, the actual function of the particle still remains unclear.³²⁸ Müller (1891: 427) has a different approach. He does not interpret *pāda a* as a simile and thus sees no comparative function of *cid*. Rather, he translates it as ‘indeed’, i.e. an emphasizer (cf. Section 5.7): ‘O Rudra, a boy indeed makes obeisance to his father who comes to greet him’. Since I do not ascribe such a function to *cid*, I do not consider this translation more adequate than the one by Macdonell. In my opinion, the most appropriate translation is the one by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 449), who render *cid* as the scalar focus particle ‘even’ and explicitly reject that *cid* is a simile marker (Jamison comm.II: ad loc.). One might object that a ‘little boy’ is not an unlikely alternative to other people that might bow down to his father because children are expected to obey their parents. However, since the poet uses the word for ‘little boy’ and not e.g. for ‘son’ (cf. ex. (290) directly below), *kumārás* may indeed be regarded as an unlikely alternative. For especially little boys are often wayward and stubborn, so that they do not obey their fathers, let alone bow down for them. As an argument for the interpretation of *cid* as a comparative particle, Geldner (1951–1957: I, 318) adduces a comparable text passage in the Taittirīya Saṃhitā which contains *iva* ‘like’ instead of *cid*. However, a comparison of this text passage with ex. (289) shows that this interpretation is by no means compelling:

³²⁷ ‘(Comme) le garçon s’incline-toujours devant le père qui loue (les dieux, ainsi me suis-je toujours-incliné devant toi), ô Rudra, quand tu t’approches’. He comments: “*cid* n’est pas strictement comparatif, bien qu’un tel passage puisse y fournir l’élán”.

³²⁸ Cp., however, the translation by Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 43), which contains both a simile marker and an additive particle: ‘Wie auch das Kind sich dem verehrten Vater in Liebe zuneigt, wenn er kommt, o Rudra’.

(290) <i>devīm</i> goddess:ACC.SG.F	<i>ahám</i> 1SG.NOM	<i>nírṛtiṃ</i> Nirṛti:ACC.SG.F		
<i>vándamānaḥ</i> praise:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M		<i>pitéva [= pitā iva]</i> father:NOM.SG.M+like	<i>putráṃ</i> son:ACC.SG.M	
<i>dasaye</i> exhaust:MID.1SG	<i>vácobhiḥ</i> word:INS.PL.N			

‘Praising Nirṛti, the goddess, Like a father his son, I weary her with my words’ TS 4.2.5.4³²⁹

This passage may contain lexemes similar to those in ex. (289) but the syntax is quite different. For instance, the case forms of ‘father’ and ‘son’/‘boy’, are interchanged compared to the Rigvedic passage. Moreover, the secondary predicate *vándamānas* ‘praising’ is in the nominative and controlled by *ahám* ‘I’, again different compared to the Rigvedic passage.³³⁰ As a result, I see no compelling reason to assume that *iva* is used as an equivalent to *cid* here.

The following text passage speaks against an interpretation of *cid* as ‘like’ too, because an interpretation as an additive particle is well possible:

(291) <i>gávaś</i> cow:NOM.PL.M	<i>cid</i> PRT	<i>ghā</i> PRT	<i>samanyavaḥ</i> unanimous:VOC.PL.M	/	<i>sajātīyena</i> same.birth:INS.SG.N
<i>marutaḥ</i> Marut:VOC.PL.M		<i>sábandhavaḥ</i> related:NOM.PL.M	/	<i>rihaté</i> lick:MID.3PL	
<i>kakúbho</i> hump:ACC.PL.F		<i>mitháḥ</i> mutually			

‘Cows **also**, likewise akin through common birth, o Maruts of equal spirit, lick each other’s humps.’ RV 8.20.21

Following Geldner (1951–1957: II, 324), one can translate ‘Akin by common lineage like cows, [...] they lick each other’s backs’.³³¹ Interestingly, Renou (1955–1969: X, 50), who in general is doubtful regarding a comparative function of *cid*, also opts for this interpretation.³³² As an argument against such an interpretation Jamison (comm.VIII.1: ad loc.) adduces that in the following stanza *cid* also occurs in the second position and cannot be translated as ‘like’. Hence, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1070) opt for a translation as ‘also’, similarly to Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 427).³³³ I believe that Jamison (comm.VIII.1: ad loc.) is correct in assuming that even

³²⁹ I have adopted the Vedic text from TITUS and the English translation from Keith (1914: 315); the glosses are mine.

³³⁰ Delbrück (1874: 10) considers changing *vándamānam* to *vándamānas* in ex. (289) but Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 214f.) deems this unnecessary. Even if the form were a nominative, it would still have a different syntactic function because it would not be controlled by the first person subject.

³³¹ ‘Wie Rinder durch gleiche Abstammung verwandt [...] lecken sie gegenseitig ihre Rücken’. Cf. also Geldner (1917: 327).

³³² ‘Tels des bœufs (qui) se lèchent les bosses l’un l’autre, ô Marut’s de même passion,/ apparentés par une naissance commune,...’.

³³³ ‘Die Rinder auch, die euch verwandt, durch gleichen Ursprung, gleichgesinnte Maruts, sind, Beleckten ihre Köpfe sich’.

though *cid* is not a comparative particle the Maruts are nevertheless compared to the cows. This comparison is evoked by the additive function of *cid*. Given that its focus is *gávas* ‘cows’, this stanza presupposes that another group of entities is akin though common birth and licks each other’s humps.³³⁴ Since this stanza is dedicated to the Maruts and they share properties with cows (Jamison comm.VIII.1: ad loc.) it is probable that the poet intends the Maruts to be this alternative. According to this interpretation, I follow Jamison & Brereton in assuming that *cid* is not scalar in this passage, contrary to Griffith (1896–1897: II, 150), who translates ‘even’.³³⁵ In the next example it is possible as well to assign *cid* a function that I have identified in a previous section:

(292) <i>pitré</i>		<i>cid</i>	<i>cakruḥ</i>	<i>sádanam</i>	<i>sám</i>
father:DAT.SG.M		PRT	do:PERF.3PL	session:ACC.SG.N	LP
<i>asmai</i>	/	<i>máhi</i>		<i>tvíṣīmat</i>	
DEM:DAT.SG.M		great:ACC.SG.N		turbulent:ACC.SG.N	
<i>sukṛto</i>		<i>ví</i>	<i>hí</i>	<i>khyán</i>	
doing.well:NOM.PL.M		LP	for	see:AOR.INJ.3PL	

‘**It was** for the father **that** they performed a ritual Session, for him also they prepared a seat, because the good workers surveyed the great, turbulent (cowpen).’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 510)

‘They made a seat for him **as** for a father, ...’ (Doniger O’Flaherty 1981: 153) RV 3.31.12ab

Among the translators, there is no general agreement on how to treat *cid*. Griffith (1896–1897: I, 349) simply does not translate it: ‘They made a mansion for their Father, deftly provided him a great and glorious dwelling’. Neither do Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 529) and Renou (1955–1969: XVII, 72).³³⁶ Doniger O’Flaherty (1981: 153; 155) apparently regards it as a comparative particle. She translates *pāda* a as ‘They made a seat for him as for a father’ and explains that “Indra is like a father to the Angirasas”. Geldner (1951–1957: I, 368f.) and Witzel et al. (2013: 58) also interpret it as a comparative particle.³³⁷ Ludwig (1876–1888: II, 71) interprets *cid* in its usual additive function and translates it as ‘auch’. Following him, one can translate *pāda* a

³³⁴ ‘I am not certain whether Jamison & Brereton also regard *gávas* as the focus of *cid*. This would require reading a stressed particle ‘Cows ALSO ...’ in their translation. Since otherwise *cid* would precede its focus, which is syntactically more marked, I consider *gávas* the focus.

³³⁵ A question that still remains is that of the function of the particle *gha*, which follows *cid*. In his discussion of RV 8.33.17, where he considers *cid* to be scalar ‘even’, Hejib-Agera (1985–1986: 78) assumes that *gha* interacts with *cid* giving it a meaning ‘no less than’ (cf. Hejib 1984: 227f.). In a case of non-scalar *cid*, the contribution of *gha* should be different. Hejib (1984: 210) also uses ‘no less than’ in his translation of ex. (291) and surmises that a function of *gha* might be to indicate the mismatch between the vocative and the verb in the third person.

³³⁶ ‘Dem Vater [dem Angiras, der hier dem Himmel gleichgesetzt scheint] bereiteten sie den Sitz’ (Grassmann); ‘(Les Angiras) ont fabriqué pour lui, leur père (Indra) un siège (sacrificiel)’ (Renou).

³³⁷ ‘Wie einem Vater bereiteten sie ihm einen Sitz’ (Geldner); ‘Wie einem Vater haben die (Angiras) ihm einen Sitz bereitet’ (Witzel et al.).

as ‘They prepared the seat for him also as a father’.³³⁸ This may be possible but I am not certain what the poet would want to express with this. As can be seen in the translation that is given in the example, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 510), who refuse to acknowledge a comparative function of *cid* (Jamison comm.III: ad loc.), attempt to render its function by means of a cleft construction. This is in accordance with the functions of *cid* that I discussed in Section 4.8, because English clefts express exhaustiveness (cf. Kiss 1998). Thus, *cid* may mark exhaustive focus here. Note that Jamison & Brereton (2014: 510) and Jamison (comm.III: ad loc.) assign *sádanam* two meanings, on the one hand ‘ritual session’ and on the other hand ‘seat’. Therefore, they translate pāda a as two clauses. A further text passage with alleged comparative *cid*, the exact syntactic interpretation of which is exceedingly difficult, is the following:

(293) <i>yújaṃ</i>	<i>hí</i>	<i>mám</i>	<i>ákrthā</i>	<i>ád</i>	<i>íd</i>
yokemate:ACC.SG.M	for	1SG.ACC	do:AOR.MID.2SG	then	PRT
<i>indra</i>	/	<i>śíro</i>	<i>dāsásya</i>	<i>námucer</i>	
Indra:VOC.SG.M		head:ACC.SG.N	Dāsa:GEN.SG.M	Namuci:GEN.SG.M	
<i>mathāyán</i>	/	<i>ásmānaṃ</i>	<i>cit</i>		
whirl:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.M		stone:ACC.SG.M	PRT		
<i>svaríyaṃ</i>	<i>vártamānam</i>	/	<i>prá</i>		
resounding:ACC.SG.M	roll:PTCP.PRS.MID.ACC.SG.M		LP		
<i>cakríyeva</i>	<i>ródasī</i>		<i>marúdbhyaḥ</i>		
wheel:NOM.DU.F+like	world.halves:NOM.DU.F		Marut:DAT.PL.M		

‘For you have made me your yokemate, Indra—just afterward stealing the head of the Dāsa Namuci, which was rolling, (like?) a whizzing stone, like the two world-halves (that roll) forth like two wheels, for the Maruts.’³³⁹ RV 5.30.8

Geldner (1901: 165) follows Sāyaṇa in assuming that *cid* is here used like *iva* ‘like’. He (1951–1957: II, 27) assumes a clause boundary before *ád id* in pāda a and according to him, one can translate from there on: ‘But you, Indra, (made) the head of the Dāsa Namuci, which rolled like a swishing rock, (roll) in a whirl. Heaven and Earth rolled it towards the Maruts like wheels’.³⁴⁰ Apparently in a similar vein, Witzel et al. (2013: 252) interpret pāda c as ‘so that (it) rolls as a crashing rock’,³⁴¹ although I do not fully understand what they mean by ‘as a rock’. Bloomfield (1916: 253) also translates *cid* as ‘like’, although his syntactic interpretation differs from Geldner: ‘But thou, O Indra, snatching the head of the Dasa Namuci (didst roll it away) ; Heaven and Earth (rolled) the turning head like a heavenly stone onward to the Maruts’. Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 326) has a skeptical attitude towards this interpretation of *cid*. Despite their

³³⁸ ‘auch als vater bereiteten sie ihm da den sitz’

³³⁹ The translation is an adaptation of Ludwig (1876–1888: II, 111) and Jamison & Brereton (2014: 693).

³⁴⁰ ‘aber du, Indra, hast das Haupt des Dāsa Namuci wirbelnd (ins Rollen gebracht), das wie ein sausender Fels rollte. Himmel und Erde (rollten) es wie Räder den Marut zu’.

³⁴¹ ‘daß (dieser) als krachender Felsbrocken rollt’.

general reluctance to interpret *cid* as a simile marker, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 693) tentatively regard the preceding word *ásmānam* ‘rock’ as a simile, supplying the possible simile marker in brackets, as the example shows. Jamison (comm.V: ad loc.) does not comment on the function of *cid* in this passage. Velankar (2003: 72) translates *cid* as ‘even’ but I am not sure how to interpret this translation (see, however, the paraphrase of this stanza by von Bradke 1892: 457, who also seems to regard *cid* as an additive particle).³⁴² I must admit that I am not able to provide an interpretation of *cid* that is more plausible than regarding it as a comparative particle. Nevertheless, the general interpretation of this stanza is exceedingly difficult and several competing approaches exist (cf. Jamison comm.V: ad loc.). Therefore, it cannot serve as clear evidence in favor of an interpretation of *cid* as a comparative particle.

There is a further text passage in which *cid* follows the form *ásmānam* and in which Geldner interprets it as a comparative particle, but unlike in the previous example it is relatively unproblematic to assign an additive function to *cid*:

(294) <i>ní</i>	<i>yé</i>	<i>riṅánti</i>	<i>ójasā</i>	/ [...] /
LP	REL:NOM.PL.M	liquefy:3PL	strength:INS.SG.N	
<i>ásmānam</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>svaríyam</i>	<i>párvatam</i>	
stone:ACC.SG.M	PRT	resounding:ACC.SG.M	mountain:ACC.SG.M	
<i>girím</i>	/	<i>prá</i>	<i>cyāvayanti</i>	<i>yāmabhiḥ</i>
mountain:ACC.SG.M		LP	shake:CAUS.3PL	journey:INS.PL.N

‘Those who liquefy (the trees) with their strength, [...] **even** the reverberant stone, the mountain, the peak do they shake on their journeys.’ RV 5.56.4

Following Geldner (1951–1957: II, 64), pādas c/d are to be translated as ‘Like a whizzing stone they move the rocky mountain by their motion’.³⁴³ Jamison (comm.V: ad loc.) rejects this and I find the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 735), who interpret *cid* as a scalar additive particle, very plausible. A rock or mountain is exceedingly hard to move, so that it constitutes an unlikely alternative to other things that the Maruts, to whom this hymn is dedicated, can shake. Hence, this is a typical context where scalar additive particles are expected. I believe that the focus of *cid* comprises the entire pāda d, regardless of whether three of the four nominals are attributes/appositions or whether the nominals are asyndetically conjoined.

The next example contains three instances of *cid*, each of which Geldner (1907–1909: I, 63) assigns the meaning ‘just like’ (‘gerade wie’):

(295) <i>paraśúm</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>ví</i>	<i>tapati</i>	/	<i>śimbalám</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>ví</i>
axe:ACC.SG.M	PRT	LP	heat:3SG		Śimbala:ACC.SG.M	PRT	LP

³⁴² ‘and then immediately you (hurled forth) even thundering and rolling Bolt, seeking to smash the head of the Dāsa Namuci’ (Velankar).

³⁴³ ‘Wie einen tausenden Stein bringen sie durch ihre Fahrten den felsigen Berg in Bewegung’.

<i>vr̥ścati</i>	/	<i>ukhā́</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>indra</i>	
hew:3SG		pot:NOM.SG.F	PRT	Indra:VOC.SG.M	
<i>yéṣantī</i>			/	<i>práyastā</i>	<i>phénam</i>
boil:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.F				LP.boil:PPP:NOM.SG.F	foam:ACC.SG.M
<i>asyati</i>					
cast:3SG					

‘**Even** the axe does he heat up; **even** the Śimbala tree does he hew apart; **even** the boiling pot, O Indra, casts its foam when overheated.’ (Klein 2013: 151) RV 3.53.22

Geldner (1907–1909: II, 59) follows Sāyaṇa in assuming that *cid* is a comparative particle here in every instance, since the latter supplies ‘so it shall be to my enemy’.³⁴⁴ Although he modifies his interpretation of this stanza, Geldner (1951–1957: I, 395) sticks to his analysis of *cid* (cf. Geldner 1897: 159). Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 254) rejects this interpretation of *cid*. He believes that specific tools are described in this stanza.³⁴⁵ Witzel et al. (2013: 91; 441) appear to be indecisive. They consider both Geldner’s and Oldenberg’s view and in their translation write the comparative particle in brackets in pādas a and b.³⁴⁶ Jamison (comm.III: ad loc.) follows Oldenberg in his interpretation of *cid* but disagrees with his overall interpretation of this stanza. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 540) provide the following translation ‘(Though) he heats his axe all the way through, it’s just a śimbala flower he hacks off. The ukhā-pot, (though) boiling, boiling over, just throws off foam, o Indra’. Following their interpretation, in pādas a/b and c/d, respectively, an event appears to be spectacular in the beginning but then turns out to be rather unspectacular (Jamison comm.III: ad loc.). Although Jamison & Brereton’s interpretation seems very plausible to me, I find their inconsistent interpretation of *cid* somewhat problematic. In pādas b and c/d they interpret it as a scalar restrictive particle ‘just’, whose focus (*śimbalām*) precedes *cid* in b and follows *cid* in c/d (*phénam* or *phénam asyati*). In pāda a, they do not render *cid*. Do they interpret *cid* in a and b as a means to emphasize the contrast between the two different objects? At least, this would not be in accordance with the employment of double *cid* that I have described in Section 4.2.³⁴⁷ At any rate, Jamison (comm.III: ad loc.) states that “in all three cases the *cid* can be interpreted in its usual ‘even, even though, just’ sense. A regular interpretation as a scalar additive particle is reflected in the

³⁴⁴ ‘so soll es meinem Feind ergehen’ (Geldner).

³⁴⁵ “Nicht um Vergleichen handelt es sich, sondern um Beschreibung konkreter Vorrichtungen”.

³⁴⁶ ‘(Wie) eine Axt, so macht er ihn ganz heiß, er zerhackt ihn (wie) den Śimbala(-Baum). Als eine siedende Pfanne, Indra, die überkocht, wirft er Schaum aus’.

³⁴⁷ Jamison (comm.III: ad loc.) considers their interpretation to be in accordance with Griffith (1896–1897: I, 375), who translates *cid* inconsistently too, the first as ‘very’, the second as ‘mere’ and the third as ‘like’: ‘He heats his very axe, and then cuts a mere Semal blossom off. O Indra, like a caldron cracked and seething, so he pours out foam’.

translation which is the most straightforward from the point of view of my study, namely the one by Klein (2013: 151), which I give in the example. Similarly to him, Renou (1955–1969: XVII, 94) translates all three instances of *cid* as the scalar additive particle ‘même’.³⁴⁸ As there is no general agreement on how this stanza is to be interpreted, even apart from the problems discussed here, I am not certain how to interpret the three instances of *cid*. On the possible interpretations of the stanza see Ludwig (1876–1888: V, 538), Griffith (1896–1897: I, 375), Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 254) and Jamison (comm.III: ad loc.). It may well be that all instances of *cid* are scalar additive particles but it is also possible that Jamison & Brereton are correct with their interpretation. Yet, this uncertainty shows again that this passage cannot be adduced as compelling evidence for a comparative function of *cid*. One further interpretation that I can exclude, however, is the one by Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 533), who translates each *cid* as a universal quantifier.³⁴⁹ In Section 4.4.2, I argued that *cid* itself does not have quantificational function.

Further passages that Geldner (1907–1909: I, 63) gives are exx. (149) and (167) in Section 4.4, where I argue that *cid* has a totalizing function. In the previous sections, I have already discussed several other passages in which Geldner (1951–1957) translates *cid* as a simile marker: In ex. (39) in Section 4.1, I assume a scalar additive function; in ex. (89) in Section 4.2, I surmise that additive *cid* occurs with the second conjunct of two coordinated adverbs; In ex. (165) in Section 4.4.2, I argue for a totalizing function; in ex. (182) in Section 4.5, I argue that *cid* functions as a degree modifier; in ex. (254) in Section 4.6.3, *cid* occurs with a concessive circumstantial secondary predicate; as I mentioned in footnote 326 in the current section, Geldner (1907–1909: I, 63) himself is uncertain whether he should regard *cid* in RV 8.66.8 as a comparative particle. On RV. 9.10.8 see Jamison (comm.IX.1: ad loc.).

The discussion of the examples in this section has shown that Renou (1955–1969: VII, 99) is correct when he points to the uncertainty of the examples that Geldner (1907–1909: I, 63) gives for *cid* as a simile marker. Among the examples that I have discussed here, there is none which is not compatible with another function of *cid* that I have described. The most difficult passage that I have discussed here is ex. (293), but there the interpretation of the entire stanza causes severe problems. Among the other occurrences of *cid* that Geldner (1951–1957) translates as ‘wie’ and that I have not discussed here explicitly I find no compelling example

³⁴⁸ ‘Il brûle même la hache, il arrache même l’arbre-simbala ; / la bassine même qui bout, ô Indra, ayant cuit (trop longtemps), projetée de l’écume’.

³⁴⁹ ‘Ein jedes Blatt [palāçám vermuthe ich statt paraçúm] brennt er hinweg, und jede Blüte bricht ab; jeder Topf, o Indra, wenn er kocht und übersiedet, wirft er Schaum’.

for such an interpretation either. I therefore agree with the claim by Jamison (comm.I.1–comm.X.4) that *cid* cannot function as a simile marker.

4.10 The syntactic behavior of *cid*

In the preceding part of Section 4, I have analyzed the different functions that I have observed for *cid*. As can be seen in the numerous examples that I have shown, *cid* regularly occurs in Wackernagel position, i.e. in the second position of the clause. However, there are also attestations in which it clearly occurs later in the clause. This is a fact that has long since been observed in the literature. Delbrück (1888: 22) distinguishes between two kinds of unaccented particles: Those that follow the word with which they are associated and those that follow the first word of the sentence. According to him, *cid* is a particle that follows the word with which it is associated (cf. Canedo 1937: 72f.). In his generative analysis, Hale (1987: 15–20) proposes a threefold distinction in which he further divides Delbrück’s first group into two subgroups. On the one hand those that occur in relative second position (i.e. second position before topicalization) and on the other hand those that occur in absolute second position. For Delbrück’s second group, which includes *cid*, Hale assumes that these elements occur behind the constituents they emphasize. He explains the regular occurrence in second position of these elements by topicalization of the constituents with which they are associated. Due to this behavior, Krisch (1990: 65) does not regard *cid* as a Wackernagel element at all.³⁵⁰ A question that arises with respect to the inconsistent syntactic behavior of *cid* is whether a difference in position correlates in some way with a difference in the interpretation of the particle. Schäufole (1991b: 69) examines the so-called initial string, in which second position enclitics and particles occur. He makes the following observation: “The clause-initial string includes [...] all particles with clausal domain, and often some with phrasal domain as well” (see also Hock 1982: 13). In addition, Schäufole (1991a: 156f.) states that sentential particles which do not occur in the initial string “are exercising scope over narrower domains”.³⁵¹ As König (1991: 46–53) explains, the scope of a focus particle may comprise the entire clause or only a smaller part too. Based on these observations, I formulate the following hypothesis with respect to the position of the particle *cid* within the clause:

³⁵⁰ Wenthe (2012: 187) subsumes *id* and *cid* under “second position” particles, together with *u*, *vā*, *nú*, *hí* and others. However, his study is mainly concerned with pronominals, so that he does not elaborate on this issue.

³⁵¹ More precisely, he states that in these cases, the “sentential particles are separated from the left clause boundary by more than two words”.

The difference in the position of *cid* corresponds to a difference in its scope.

- (i) When *cid* occurs in Wackernagel position, its scope is the entire clause or a smaller portion of this clause.
- (ii) When *cid* does not occur in Wackernagel position, its scope is smaller than the clause.

Lühr (2017: 281) states that “word-level enclitics like the emphasizing particles *cid*, *íd* have scope over a single word or constituent, and are placed directly behind this word or constituent”. I do not agree with this analysis.³⁵² Consider this example of *cid* as an additive focus particle:

(296) *ásmānaṃ cid yé bibhidúr vácobhir*
 rock:ACC.SG.M PRT REL:NOM.PL.M cleft:PERF.3PL song:INS.PL.N

‘who with their songs cleft **even** the mountain open’ (Lühr 2017: 284) RV 4.16.6c

According to the definition of scope that I use, the entire clause is within the scope of *cid* because the entire clause is relevant for the interpretation of the particle. The word which precedes *cid* is its focus. Similarly to Lühr, Hale (1996: 174) assigns the particles *íd* and *cid* “lexical rather than clausal domain” and observes that Hock (1982) does not regard them in his template for the initial string. However, it is well possible that the impression that *íd* and *cid* behave differently is due to the fact that there is a greater likelihood for the scope of focus particles like *íd* and *cid* to be smaller than the whole clause than for particles like *hí* ‘for, because’. Note that my examination is not concerned with the position of *cid* relative to other second-position elements in the initial string or the general form of the initial string. On the order of elements within the so-called initial string in the Rigveda and in Vedic prose see Delbrück (1893–1900: III, 51f.), Hock (1982, 1992, 1996, 1997: 115–124), Hale (1991, 1996, 2007: 202–212, 2017, 2017–2018: 1932–1936), Schäufele (1991b: 69–78; 1991a, 1996), Krisch (1990, 1997), Gippert (2004: 53–56), Lühr (2010: 128–131), Keydana (2011), Lowe (2011; 2014) and Ram-Prasad (2023).

According to the hypothesis that I have formulated above, the Wackernagel position is ambiguous with respect to the scope of *cid*, whereas a later position indicates a scope that is smaller than the clause. Accordingly, in order to validate the hypothesis it is necessary to investigate all cases in which *cid* occurs later than in the second position and to show that in these cases the scope of *cid* is smaller than the clause. At first sight, it seems unusual to regard one syntactic position as unambiguous with respect to the scope whereas the other one is ambiguous. However, that one syntactic structure is ambiguous whereas another is not can also be found in English. Consider the following examples from Taglicht (1984: 157f.):

³⁵² Lühr (2017) does not define how she uses the term SCOPE so that my disagreement may be primarily terminological.

(297) *Some of these poems* \$–were translated **also** [by Ezra Pound]_F–\$

(298) a. \$–[Ezra Pound]_F **also** translated some of these poems–\$

b. \$–[Ezra Pound]_F **also** translated–\$ some of these poems

The passive sentence only allows for one reading whereas the active one is ambiguous. Following the analysis by Taglicht (1984: 158), ex. (297) and the b. sentence of ex. (298) mean that some poems were translated by different people, by Ezra Pound and someone else. In contrast, the a. sentence means that some poems were translated by Ezra Pound and some others by someone else. Notice that in ex. (298) *also* is stressed whereas in ex. (297) it is not.

A case of initial *cid* whose scope is the entire clause is ex. (296) above. An example of initial *cid* taking smaller scope than the clause is the following passage:

(299) <i>vīlú</i>	cid	<i>ārujatnúbhir</i>	/	<i>gúhā</i>	cid	<i>indra</i>
firm:ACC.SG.N	PRT	breaking:INS.PL.M		in.hiding	PRT	Indra:VOC.SG.M
<i>váhnibhiḥ</i>		/	<i>ávinda</i>	<i>usríyā</i>		<i>ánu</i>
conveyor:INS.PL.M			find:IPRF.2SG	ruddy:ACC.PL.F		LP

‘Along with the (ritual-)conveyors [=Aṅgirasas] who break **even** the stronghold, o Indra, you discovered the ruddy (cattle) **even** in the hiding place.’ RV 1.6.5³⁵³

I have already discussed this example in Section 4.2. There, I argued that the scope of the first instance of *cid* is only the nominal expression in which it occurs. Since this instance of *cid* already occupies the first position, the second one cannot assume it anymore (see also below).

The Rigveda contains 691 attestations of *cid*. However, not all of them are eligible for an investigation regarding the scope of this particle. From my syntactic investigation I will exclude those cases in which *cid* occurs in fixed collocations. This means that I will not include the 68 cases in which *cid* occurs after an interrogative proform as these indefinite proforms appear to behave syntactically like other nominals or adverbs. Likewise, I will not include the 26 instances of *nú* (*anyátrā*) *cid* and the 2 instances of *nú cid*. In Section 4.3.2, I argued that *nú cid* tends to assume different positions in the clause depending on its interpretation as positive or negative, even though this distribution allows for exceptions. For *cid* after *nú*, one might argue that *cid* does have the function of a focus particle and therefore these cases should be included. Nevertheless their syntactic behavior might be influenced by the use of *nú cid*.³⁵⁴ If these cases are subtracted, my investigation comprises 595 instances of *cid*.

Among the 595 cases that are relevant for my hypothesis, *cid* occurs 341 times in the absolute second position of the clause. By absolute second position I mean that *cid* occurs after the first word of the clause, as in ex. (296) above. I also include those passages in which the

³⁵³ The translation deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

³⁵⁴ I do, however include the passage in which *cid* occurs after a relative pronoun or the conjunction *yád*, where it regularly marks a concessive conditional clause.

particle chain occurs after the first word but *cid* is not the first element in this chain, as in the following example:

(300) <i>só</i> [=sá u]	<i>cin</i>	<i>nú</i>	<i>bhadrá</i>	
DEM:NOM.SG.F+PRT	PRT	now	bringing.happiness:NOM.SG.F	
<i>kṣumátī</i>		<i>yásasvatī</i>	/	<i>uṣá</i>
rich.in.food:NOM.SG.F		splendid:NOM.SG.F		Dawn:NOM.SG.F
<i>uvāsa</i>	<i>mánave</i>		<i>súvarvatī</i>	
flash:PERF.3SG	man:DAT.SG.M		celestial:NOM.SG.F	

‘That Uṣas **too** has shone for the sake of man, bringing nourishment, fame and light with her’ (Velankar 1958: 11) RV 10.11.3ab

In this clause, the first word is the demonstrative *sá* and it is followed by the enclitic particles *u* and *cid* and by the accented *nú*. Subtracting all cases of the types exemplified by exx. (296) and (300), there are 254 passages left in which *cid* does not occur in absolute second position. In the following, I will examine these cases more closely.

The first group of cases in which *cid* does not assume the absolute second position but nevertheless takes scope over the entire clause is unproblematic to the hypothesis under investigation (cf. Schäufele 1991a: 156–158). In these cases, *cid* occurs in the so-called ‘modified’ Wackernagel position. Among these cases, there is a text passage in which the first word of an utterance is a vocative. Initial vocatives are not part of the clause before which they occur (Delbrück 1888: 36). The only example of this kind in the Rigveda is the following:

(301) <i>índra</i>	<i>yáthā</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>āvitha</i>	/	<i>vájeṣu</i>
Indra:VOC.SG.M	like	PRT	help:PERF.2SG		prize.contest:LOC.PL.M
<i>purumāyiyam</i>					
Purumāyya:ACC.SG.M					

‘o Indra [...] **just** as you helped Purumāyya in the prize-contests’ RV 8.68.10cd

Similarly, Delbrück (1888: 36f.) observes that also the initial discourse marker *átho* does not appear to be a proper part of the actual clause. Hock (1989: 115) states the same not only about *átho* but also about *tád* and *sá*.³⁵⁵ He explains that “[l]ike German coordinating conjunctions of the type *und* ‘and’, *aber* ‘but’, *denn* ‘for’, words placed in this position do not ‘count’ as the first element of the clause”. One further element of this class that Schäufele (1993: 142) mentions is *áthā*, so that I also include the similar form *ádha* in this group.³⁵⁶ Consider the following example:

³⁵⁵ He refers only to the cases in which these forms function as clause connectors and not as actual pronouns.

³⁵⁶ On the relation between *áthā*, *átho*, *ádha* and *ád* and on their functions see Klein (1985a: 63–138). Since the connectives discussed here derive from proforms, they can also occur as the first word of a clause, directly followed by particles (Schäufele 1993: 146).

(302) <i>ádha</i>	<i>dyaúś</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>ápa</i>	<i>sá</i>	<i>nú</i>
then	heaven:NOM.SG.M	PRT	2SG.GEN	LP	DEM:NOM.SG.F	now
<i>vájrād</i>	/	<i>dvitānamad</i>		<i>bhiyāsā</i>	<i>svásya</i>	
mace:ABL.SG.M		doubly+bow:IPRF.3SG		fear:INS.SG.F	own:GEN.SG.M	
<i>manyóḥ</i>						
fury:GEN.SG.M						

‘Then **even** Heaven, she [=Earth] likewise also, bent away from your mace, through fear of your own battle fury’ RV 6.17.9ab

As in the utterance with an initial vocative, *cid* occurs here in the third position but this is the second position after the extra-clausal *ádha*. Even though Jamison (comm.VI.1: ad loc.) expresses “despair” caused by the syntax of this clause, she recognizes the position of an emphatic particle in the second position after the “extraclausal introductory *ádha*” as usual in the Rigveda. Nevertheless, the only other example of this kind involving *cid* is RV 6.10.4.

Another group of 40 passages which do not constitute counterevidence comprises cases in which it is possible to assume a clause boundary before the word that precedes *cid*. Consider the following passage:

(303) <i>satyám</i>	<i>tveṣā</i>	<i>ámavanto</i>	/	
true:NOM.SG.N	dazzling:NOM.PL.M	hard.charging:NOM.PL.M		
<i>dhánvañ</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>ā</i>	<i>rudríyāsaḥ</i>	/
desert:LOC.SG.N	PRT	LP	son.of.Rudra:NOM.PL.M	
<i>míhaṃ</i>	<i>kṛṇvanti</i>	<i>avātám</i>		
rain:ACC.SG.F	do:3SG	not.drying.up:ACC.SG.F		

‘This is real: the dazzling, hard-charging sons of Rudra **even** in the desert create unquenchable mist.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 146)

‘Truly they are terrible and powerful; **even** to the desert the Rudriyas bring rain that is never dried up.’ (Müller 1891: 81) RV 1.38.7

The interpretation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 146) would violate my hypothesis, because *cid* would be in the fourth position of the clause but nevertheless the whole clause would be within its scope. In contrast, the interpretation by Müller (1891: 81), who assumes a clause boundary after pāda a, is completely in accordance with my hypothesis. As the clause boundaries in cases like this are open to interpretation, I do not regard such cases as counterevidence to my hypothesis. The following group of passages also constitutes only apparent counterevidence:

(304) <i>tuvám</i>	<i>tyám</i>	<i>indra</i>	<i>sūriyam</i>	/
2SG.NOM	DEM:ACC.SG.M	Indra:VOC.SG.M	sun:ACC.SG.M	
<i>paścā</i>	<i>sántam</i>	<i>purás</i>	<i>kṛdhi</i>	/
behind	be:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.SG.M	LP	do:AOR.IMP.2SG	
<i>devānām</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>tiró</i>	<i>vásam</i>	
god:GEN.PL.M	PRT	LP	will:ACC.SG.M	

‘You, Indra—set this sun in front, though it is behind, **even** athwart the will of the gods.’
RV 10.171.4

Here, *cid* occurs near the end of the stanza, more precisely in the second position of the last pāda. A closer look at the syntactic structure of this stanza reveals that the clause in pādas a/b would be complete even without the last pāda. This suggests that pāda c is not a proper part of the clause but that it is rather to be interpreted as an afterthought (cf. Delbrück 1878: 54f.). Notice that *cid* retains its tendency to occur in the second position, for it occurs in the second position of the afterthought. This group contains 10 passages.

Having identified the cases in which *cid* only appears to occur later in the clause, I now turn to cases in which this is really so. In the first group of these passages, *cid* strictly speaking occurs in the third position, but it nevertheless counts as Wackernagel position, or ‘modified’ Wackernagel position. Consider first the following passage given by Hale (2007: 208):

(305) *utá* *vā* *yó* *no* *marcáyād*
and or REL:NOM.SG.M 1PL.ACC harm:SBJV.3SG

ánāgaso
without.offense:ACC.PL.M

‘**Or** if a hostile mortal, a lone wolf, is about to injure **us** who are without offense’ RV 2.23.7a

This clause contains two enclitics, *vā* ‘or’ and *nas* ‘us’. Hale (2007: 208f.), who pursues a generative syntactic analysis, still regards both elements as in Wackernagel position and assumes a “break-up of Wackernagel’s Law into a set of component processes”. For alternative accounts see the references on the initial string that I have given above. What is important here is that enclitics are still to be regarded as occurring in the initial string even if they do not occur in absolute second position. Krisch (1997: 283f.) provides the following general patterns for the initial string (see also Krisch 1990):

(306) #X(E).....#
(307) #X(E₁)C(E₂).....#³⁵⁷

Somewhat differently, Lowe (2014: 14) provides the following pattern for the initial string:

(308) (Conj) (Conj) (XP) (XP) (Prvb) (Dem./Rel.Prons) (Pcls) (Prons)³⁵⁸

As Lowe explains, these elements are not obligatory. He is not certain whether two (XP)s are allowed or only one. I will only allow one. Consider the following example:

(309) *tuvám* *tiyá* *cid* *ácyutā*
2SG.NOM DEM:ACC.PL.N PRT unstirtable:ACC.PL.N

³⁵⁷ X = word; E = Wackernagel enclitic; C = relative/interrogative pronoun, conjunction; with Hock (1997: 118f.), I assume that C includes demonstratives too. Krisch also considers verbs to be in this category.

³⁵⁸ Conj = conjunction. The first one is stressed, the second one is unstressed; XP = constituent; Prvb = preverb (local particle); Dem./Rel.Prons = demonstrative/relative pronouns; Pcls = particles; Prons = pronouns

‘You (eat) **just** these unstirring things,’ RV 6.2.9a

According to the notation by Lowe (2014: 14), the beginning of this clause can be schematized as *(XP) (Dem.Pron) (Ptcl)*. This means that even though it is not in absolute second position, *cid* occurs in a position that is typical for Wackernagel elements. I find 4 further comparable cases in the Rigveda. Compare this now with the following example:

(310) <i>yó</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>imám</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>tmánā</i>	/
REL:NOM.SG.M	1SG.DAT	DEM:ACC.SG.M	PRT	PRT	breath:INS.SG.M	
<i>ámandac</i>	<i>citrám</i>	<i>dāváne</i>				
exhilarate:IPRF.3SG	brilliant:ACC.SG.N	give:INF.DAT.SG				

‘The one of good resolve who by his breath invigorated **just** this man here, to give something brilliant to me’ RV 8.46.27ab

This passage does not fit into the pattern given above. Here, the relative pronoun is followed by the enclitic personal pronoun, which itself is followed by a demonstrative. After this, the two particles *cid* and *u* occur. This is all the more astonishing because according to Lowe (2014: 14), *u* should be subsumed under the first instance of *(Conj)* in his schema.³⁵⁹ However, since *cid* occurs together with *u*, which is itself supposed to occur in the initial string, I regard this as a fifth instance of the group where *cid* occurs in the initial string, although it is less clear than ex. (309). As according to Lowe, *(XP)* may also consist of complex expressions, I will also regard the following example as a case of *cid* in Wackernagel position:

(311) <i>rāyá</i>	<i>yujá</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>úttarā</i>
wealth:INS.SG.M	united:INS.SG.F	PRT	higher:NOM.SG.F
<i>sákhibhyaḥ</i>			
companion:ABL.PL.M			

‘With wealth as her yokemate, she is **even** higher than her companions.’ RV 7.95.4d

The nominal expression *rāyá yujá* ‘with wealth as yokemate’ is complex, and *cid* follows it. Hence, what makes this case unusual is rather its position with respect to its focus rather than the position in the clause. For if *rāyá yujá* were its focus (cf. Velankar 1963b: 207), I would expect *cid* to occur after *rāyá*, in which case it would also be in absolute second position. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1003) construe it with the following word. I am indecisive as to which is correct. Nevertheless, I also regard this group only as apparent counterexamples.

I have now discussed the exceptions that are only apparent and those cases in which *cid* occurs in ‘modified’ Wackernagel position. One further group of cases in which *cid* does not occur in the absolute second position of the clause is when there are two instances of *cid* that are present in one clause (cf. Section 4.2). Then, only one *cid* can assume the second position

³⁵⁹ Notice also that *u* follows *cid* in this passage whereas elsewhere when *u* and *cid* occur in adjacent position, *u* precedes *cid*.

whereas the other one has to occur later in the clause. One such example that I have discussed in Section 4.2 is ex. (79), which is repeated as ex. (312) here:

(312) *trír ā diváḥ savitā soṣavīti / rájānā mitrávaruṇā supāñī /*

<i>āpaś</i> water:NOM.PL.F	<i>cid</i> PRT	<i>asya</i> DEM:GEN.SG.M	<i>ródasī</i> world.halves:NOM.DU.F	<i>cid</i> PRT
<i>urvī</i> broad:NOM.DU.F	/	<i>rátanam</i> treasure:ACC.SG.N	<i>bhikṣanta</i> apportion:DES.INJ.MID.3PL	
<i>savitúḥ</i> Savitar:GEN.SG.M		<i>savāya</i> impulse:DAT.SG.M		

‘Three times a day Savitar keeps impelling (and?) the two kings, Mitra and Varuṇa, of good hands. **Even** the waters, **even** the two broad world-halves beg for his treasure, for Savitar to impel it.’ RV 3.56.7

There are 17 instances of this kind. In the following group of cases, the scope of *cid* comprises only one conjunct of two or more coordinated elements. This conjunct may consist of only one single word but also be more complex:

(313) *ichāmīd* *dhydá* *mānasā* *cid*
search:1SG+PRT heart:INS.SG.N mind:INS.SG.N PRT

índram
Indra:ACC.SG.M

‘I am just searching, with my heart and mind, for Indra.’ RV 6.28.5d

(314) *idám* *agne* *súdhitaṃ*
DEM:NOM.SG.N Agni:VOC.SG.M well.formed:NOM.SG.N

dúrdhitād *ádhi* / *priyád* *u* *cin*
badly.formed:ABL.SG.N LP dear:ABL.SG.N PRT PRT

mánmanaḥ *préyo* *astu* *te*
thought:ABL.SG.N dear:COMP.NOM.SG.N be:IMP.3SG 2SG.GEN

‘Let this well-formed (thought) be dearer to you than one poorly formed, o Agni, and dearer to you **even** than your own dear thought.’ RV 1.140.11ab

Regarding ex. (313), I argued in Section 4.2 that *cid* is used to emphasize that the second conjunct is added to the first one (‘with my heart and also with my mind’). In ex. (314), there are two things that the poet wants the well-formed thought to be, to be dearer than one poorly formed and to be dearer than Agni’s own thought. The presence of *cid* is only relevant for the second conjunct, not for the first one. In fact, pāda a might even be interpreted as a separate clause where the predicate is omitted. In this group, there are 14 instances of *cid*.

In another group of passages, the late position of *cid* is explicable by the fact that its scope comprises only a loose apposition, as in the following example:

(315) *sárvaṃ* *rājabhyaḥ* *paramā* *cid* *ánti*
all:NOM.SG.N king:DAT.PL.M farthest:NOM.PL.N PRT before

‘Nigh to the kings is all, **even** what is farthest.’ (Macdonell [n.d.]: 27) RV 2.27.3d

Among loose appositions, Quirk et al. (1985 [2008]: 1308) distinguish between three different types: equivalence, attribution and inclusion.³⁶⁰ Ex. (315) exhibits the third type, viz. inclusion. Here, *paramā cid* ‘even the farthest (things)’ is an apposition of *sārvam* ‘everything’. More specifically, ‘even the farthest (things)’ is a subset of, and thus included in, the set of ‘everything’. The presence of *cid* expresses that the elements of this subset are especially unlikely to be in front of the kings. Since the apposition ‘even the farthest (things)’ is merely a specifying comment on the nominal ‘everything’, the scope of *cid* contains just this apposition and not the entire clause. The Rigveda contains 17 cases of this kind. In this group I also include parenthetical comments like ex. (287) in Section 4.8.

In addition to loose appositions, there are other cases in which the scope of *cid* extends only over one expression and not the entire clause. One such case can be seen in the following example:

(316) *sá* *kīrīṇā* *ciṭ* *sānitā*
 DEM:NOM.SG.M weak:INS.SG.M PRT winner:NOM.SG.M
dhānāni
 stake:ACC.PL.N

‘**Even** with the humble he acquireth riches.’ (Griffith 1896–1897: I, 129)

‘He, **even** in association with a weakling, is the winner of the stakes.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 238)

‘In association with **just** a weakling, he is the winner of the stakes’ (my adaptation) RV 1.100.9c

According to the observations made in Section 4.8, this is one of the contexts in which *cid* is ambiguous between a scalar additive particle, with scope over the entire clause, and a scalar exclusive particle, with local scope. Hence, it is plausible to assume that the latter is the case here. Yet differently, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 238) consider *kīrīṇā cid* to be a parenthetical comment. I find 12 passages where the scope of *cid* contains only one expression. Note that these expressions may be complex and not always is an ambiguity between a scalar additive and exclusive reading involved.

In another group of passages, what occurs before the word that precedes *cid* is a participle construction or a secondary predicate, as in the following example:

(317) *triśīrṣāṇam* *saptāraśmiṃ*
 three.headed:ACC.SG.M seven.reined:ACC.SG.M
jaghanvān / *tvāṣṭrasya* *cin* *nīḥ*
 hit:PTCP.PERF.ACT.NOM.SG.M son.of.Tvaṣṭar:GEN.SG.M PRT LP

³⁶⁰ On possible relationships between two nominals in the Rigveda see also Pinault (1997: 118–131); on nominal apposition see Bauer (2017: 81–86).

<i>sasrje</i>	<i>tritó</i>	<i>gáh</i>
release:PERF.MID.3SG	Trita:NOM.SG.M	cow:ACC.PL.F

‘Having smashed the three-headed, seven-reined (monster), Trita let loose the cows, **even** those of Tvaṣṭar’s son.’ RV 10.8.8cd

I find 4 cases of this kind. Here, one may assume that the participle construction or adjunct is outside the scope of *cid*.

The following group of passages differs from the ones that I have discussed previously because here, *cid* does not function as an additive or exclusive particle. Rather, in this group I subsume those cases in which it is possible to assign it a totalizing function or the function of a degree modifier. In such cases too, the scope is smaller than the entire clause. Consider the following example:

(318) <i>rujā</i>	<i>dṛlḥā</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>rakṣásaḥ</i>
shatter:IMP.2SG	be.firm:PPP.ACC.PL.N	PRT	demon:GEN.SG.M
<i>sádāmsi</i>			
seat:ACC.PL.N			

‘Shatter **even** the entrenched seats of the demon.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1330)

‘Shatter the **very** firm seats of the demon.’ (my adaptation) RV 9.91.4a

As I have outlined in the respective sections, and as can also be seen in this example, it is not always easy to distinguish between totalizing or degree modifying *cid* and additive *cid* with narrow focus on the attribute. Nevertheless, I subsume under this group all cases in which such a reading is possible. I find 27 such cases.

With respect to the scope of *cid*, it has to be borne in mind that it can co-occur with other scope-bearing elements. These elements may take wide scope over *cid*, so that this can explain the occurrence of *cid* later in the clause. One such group are clauses that exhibit the discourse particles *sma* or *ha* in Wackernagel position:

(319) <i>ṛténa</i>	<i>hí</i>	<i>ṣmā</i>	<i>vṛṣabhás</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>aktáh</i>	/
truth:INS.SG.N	for	PRT	bull:NOM.SG.M	PRT	anoint:PPP.NOM.SG.M	
<i>púmāṃ</i>		<i>agníḥ</i>	<i>páyasā</i>		<i>prṣṭhíyena</i>	/
male:NOM.SG.M		Agni:NOM.SG.M	milk:INS.SG.M		on.the.top:INS.SG.N	
<i>áspandamāno</i>		<i>acarad</i>		<i>vayodhá</i>		
NEG.buck:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M		move:IPRF.3SG		giving.vigor:NOM.SG.M		

‘Because by truth **even** the bull, the male Agni, was anointed with the milk on the top [=cream, that is, butter], not bucking, he went about conferring vigor’ RV 4.3.10a–c

(320) <i>yáthā</i>	<i>ha</i>	<i>tyád</i>	<i>vasavo</i>	<i>gauríyaṃ</i>
like	PRT	DEM:ACC.SG.N	good:VOC.PL.M	buffalo.cow:ACC.SG.F
<i>cit</i>	/	<i>padí</i>	<i>ṣitām</i>	<i>ámuñcatā</i>
PRT		foot:LOC.SG.M	bind:PPP.ACC.SG.F	release:IPRF.2PL

<i>yajatrāh</i>	/	<i>evó</i>	<i>ṣú</i>	<i>asmán</i>
worthy.of.sacrifice:VOC.PL.M		so+PRT	PRT	1PL.ABL
<i>muñcatā</i>	<i>ví</i>	<i>ámhaḥ</i>		
release:IMP.2PL	LP	constraint:ACC.SG.N		

‘Just as then you released the buffalo-cow bound by the foot, you good ones worthy of the sacrifice, so release constraint from us.’ RV 4.12.6a–c

Based on the studies by Mumm (2004) and Hejib (1984), respectively, I assume that *sma* and *ha* take scope over *cid*. Mumm (2004: 35) finds that *sma* may even take scope over an entire hymn and Hejib (1984: 246) explains that *ha* “governs the meaning of the entire speech-unit”. I find two further cases where *cid* occurs later in a clause with *ha* in second position but no further case for *sma*.

A similar group is constituted by 5 cases in which *íd* occurs in the second position, although such cases are more problematic. Consider the following examples:

(321) <i>véṣṭíd</i> [= <i>véṣi íd</i>]	<i>éko</i>	<i>yudháye</i>
pursue:2SG+PRT	one:NOM.SG.M	fight:INF.DAT.SG
<i>bhū́yasaś</i>	<i>cit</i>	
many:ACC.PL.M	PRT	

‘Alone you truly pursue **even** the many for battle.’³⁶¹ RV 5.30.4b

(322) <i>asmā́</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>gnáś</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>devápatnīr</i>	/
DEM:DAT.SG.M	PRT	PRT	wife:NOM.PL.F	PRT	wife.of.gods:NOM.PL.F	
<i>indrāya</i>	<i>arkám</i>	<i>ahihátya</i>				
Indra:DAT.SG.M	song:ACC.SG.M	slaying.of.serpent:LOC.SG.N				
<i>ūvuḥ</i>						
weave:PERF.3PL						

‘Just for this one, for Indra, **even** the ladies, the Wives of the Gods, wove a chant at the Vṛtra-smashing.’ RV 1.61.8ab

In ex. (321), *íd* emphasizes the truth of the proposition (Section 5.8.2). Thus, similarly to *sma* and *ha* above, it should take wide scope over *cid* in this example. Ex. (322) is more problematic. Here, *íd* functions as a focus particle. It is plausible to interpret it as exclusive (Section 5.1) so that one may paraphrase this passage as ‘Only for him did even the Wives of the Gods weave a chant’, which indicates wide scope of *íd*. Yet, it cannot be excluded that the scope relations are reverse: ‘Even the Wives of the Gods wove a chant only for him’. Moreover, Indra is also mentioned in the previous stanza so that it is possible that *íd* is not exclusive but emphatically asserts the identity of *asmā́* ‘for him’ and the referent of the previous stanza (Section 5.2): ‘The Wives of the Gods wove a chant for just this one’.³⁶² This would mean that *íd* has only local

³⁶¹ The translation deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

³⁶² I will argue that the presence of the particle *u* is not indicative of the function of *íd*.

scope, i.e. also with this interpretation *cid* would take wide scope. However, as cases like this are not entirely clear, I do not regard them as clear counterevidence to my hypothesis. In three passages, *cid* occurs in a question:

(323) <i>kó</i>	<i>vām</i>	<i>dāśat</i>	<i>sumatáye</i>	<i>cid</i>
who:NOM.SG.M	2DU.ACC	serve:INJ.3SG	favor:DAT.SG.F	PRT
<i>asyaí</i>				
DEM:DAT.SG.F				

‘Who will serve you two for this **very** favor [...]?’ RV 1.158.2a

Note that in this passage, the exact function of *cid* is unclear, which also makes it exceedingly difficult to decide how far its scope extends. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 336) appear to interpret it as an identifier. The position after the nominal instead of the demonstrative may be unusual, but I cannot exclude the possibility. In RV 10.131.2, the function of *cid* is unclear as well. However, the discourse particle *aṅgá* probably marks the question in this passage as non-canonical and therefore takes wide scope over *cid* irrespective of its function (cf. Coenen 2023). The third passage is ex. (56) in Section 4.1, where I argue that *cid* functions as a beneath operator. Thus, in all three passages one may argue that *cid* takes narrow scope with respect to the question operator or another particle.³⁶³

A further group of passages where *cid* does not occur in initial position is formed by cases where it occurs within participle constructions or secondary predicates, as in the following example:

(324) <i>sá</i>	<i>gítso</i>	<i>agnís</i>	<i>táruṇas</i>	<i>cid</i>
DEM:NOM.SG.M	smart:NOM.SG.M	Agni:NOM.SG.M	newborn:NOM.SG.M	PRT
<i>astu</i>				
be:IMP3SG				

‘Let Agni be sharp-witted, **though** of tender age’ RV 7.4.2a

This group contains 27 passages. These cases are typically, though not exclusively, concessive circumstantials. It is necessary to object here that in cases like ex. (324) the position of *cid* does not correlate with its scope. For according to König (2017: 33), when English *even* precedes the subordinator in a (concessive) conditional construction it takes scope over the entire complex construction. And ex. (324) can be paraphrased as ‘Even if he is of tender age, let Agni be sharp-witted’. However, one may argue here that the position of concessive circumstantials containing *cid* may be influenced by other types of secondary predicates. In particular, as I have shown in Section 4.6.3, it is possible that *cid* is present but has a function that is different from indicating concessive semantics (ex. (243)). Hence, these structures formally resemble

³⁶³ On the problems with respect to *cid* as a beneath operator see my discussion of exx. (326)–(329) below.

concessive circumstantials but the scope of *cid* is actually restricted to, or smaller than, the secondary predicate.³⁶⁴ I therefore do not regard concessive circumstantials as clear counterevidence.

Other passages that I do not regard as clear counterevidence either are those in which *cid* follows or precedes *ā́*. In the Rigveda, *ā́* is used as a local particle, but it can also have the function of an emphatic particle or a conjunction (Grassmann 1873: 168–171; Macdonell 1916: 216; Renou 1952: 318f.; 374f.; 378; Viti 2007: 41; Casaretto 2017: 66).³⁶⁵ Based on Dunkel (1997a: 21–23), RIVELEX (II, 32) also interprets *ā́* as an affirmative marker when it does not occur with a verb but occupies the first position of the sentence.³⁶⁶ When combined, emphatic *ā́* and *cid* appear to function together but it is not clear what their exact function is. As a translation of *ā́ cid*, Geldner (1907–1909: I, 22) provides a range of English and German particles and adverbs: ‘very, the very, sogar, selbst, ganz, gar, recht, wirklich’. Renou (1952: 375) assigns it the meaning ‘verily’ (‘vraiment’), and regards it as equivalent to the reverse order *cid ā́*. However, following Dunkel (1997a: 15), especially after nouns in a local case form the emphatic function of *ā́* is hard to discern from that as a local particle, and in several instances of *cid ā́*, *ā́* might be a local particle and not emphatic (Kuiper 1973: 201). As I am not able to determine clearly either when *ā́* is emphatic or what the exact function of *ā́ cid* or *cid ā́* is, I do not regard any of the passages containing *ā́ cid* or *cid ā́* that cannot be explained by one of the criteria discussed above as clear counterevidence. I find 10 such passages. Consider now the following passage:

(325) <i>vidyā́m</i>		<i>ā́dityā́</i>		<i>ávaso</i>		<i>vo</i>
know:PERF.OPT.1SG		Ā́ditya:VOC.PL.M		help:GEN.SG.N		2PL.GEN
<i>asyá</i>	/	<i>yá́d</i>		<i>aryaman</i>		<i>bhayá</i>
DEM:GEN.SG.N		REL:NOM.SG.N		Aryaman:VOC.SG.M		fear:LOC.SG.N
<i>ā́</i>	<i>cin</i>	<i>mayobhú</i>				
LP	PRT	delighting:NOM.SG.N				

‘Might I know this help of yours, o Ā́dityas, which **even** in time of fear is joy, o Aryaman.’
RV 2.27.5ab

In Section 4.7, I argued that *cid* can be regarded as an additive particle here. Nevertheless, it is not certain whether the presence of *ā́*, which according to RIVELEX (II, 26) is emphatic here,

³⁶⁴ There are also concessive circumstantials that are not marked by *cid*. However, the examples that Lowe (2015: 178–180) gives also occur in the beginning of the clause.

³⁶⁵ Dunkel (1982) argues that *ā́* has no primary connective function. Viti (2007: 41), in accordance with Dunkel (1982: 96f.), regards the connective function as secondary, because in the example she gives “the emphatic usage is [...] still evident”.

³⁶⁶ An additional function of *ā́* is that it occurs with the vocative and can be rendered as ‘oh!’ (RIVELEX II, 2).

influences the syntactic behavior of *cid*. A further problematic subgroup are negated clauses.

Compare the following passages:

(326) *ná* *te* *dūré* *paramā́* *cid*
 NEG 2SG.DAT distance:LOC.SG.N farthest:NOM.PL.N PRT
rājāṃsi
 dim.space:NOM.PL.N

‘Not **even** the farthest dusky realms are at a distance for you.’³⁶⁷ RV 3.30.2a

(327) *ugráśya* *cin* *manyáve* *ná* *namante*
 mighty:GEN.SG.M PRT fury:DAT.SG.M NEG+LP bow:MID.3SG

‘**Even** to the battle fury of the mighty they do not bow’ RV 10.34.8c

The situation is complicated further by the fact that even with respect to English, there is discord among semanticists. As I have explained in Section 2, several scholars assume that negative *even* takes wide scope over negation, regardless of its syntactic position. This would mean that the position of *cid* is not indicative of its scope. According to the second view, viz. that *even* is ambiguous, one may say that in the first example negative *cid* has narrow scope with respect to the negation and in the second example, positive *cid* has wide scope over the negation. However, there is no way to test this assumption. This holds true also if one applies the analysis by Gast & van der Auwera (2011), according to which one may analyze exx. (326) and (327) in the following manner:

(328) NEG(CID([[*the farthest dusky realms*]_F are at a distance for you]))

- The text proposition of the local domain [[*the farthest dusky realms are at a distance for you*]] is pragmatically weaker than other context propositions, e.g. [[*the nearby village is at a distance for you*]].
- The text proposition of the host domain [[*the farthest dusky realms are at not a distance for you*]] is pragmatically stronger than other context propositions, e.g. [[*the nearby village is not at a distance for you*]].

(329) CID(NEG([[*they bow [to the battle fury of the mighty]*]_F]))

- The text proposition of the local domain [[*they do not bow to the battle fury of the mighty*]] is pragmatically stronger than other context propositions, e.g. [[*they do not bow to the anger of a weakling*]].

This may seem plausible but since the two semantic analyses yield the same reading I see no way to test my hypothesis empirically. Gast & van der Auwera (2011: 17) remark that “language-specific particularities need to be taken into account when scope relations within the minimal clause are concerned”. Since these particularities are the very object of my investigation there is the peril of circularity in my argumentation, so that I will regard cases like exx. (326) and (327) as unclear. These two are the only cases in which *cid* occurs late in a

³⁶⁷ The translation deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

negative clause. A further passage where I analyze *cid* as a beneath operator is ex. (57) in Section 4.1, where it occurs with the participle of a desiderative.³⁶⁸

The last group of passages that I do not regard as counterevidence to my hypothesis are passages in which I have not been able to determine what the function of *cid* is, as in the following example:

(330) <i>ayám</i>	<i>sú</i>	<i>túbhyaṃ</i>	<i>varuṇa</i>
DEM:NOM.SG.M	PRT	2SG.DAT	Varuṇa:VOC.SG.M
<i>svadhāvo</i>	/	<i>hrdí</i>	<i>stóma</i>
independent:VOC.SG.M		heart:LOC.SG.N	praise:NOM.SG.M
<i>úpaśritaś</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>astu</i>	
LP.lean:PPP.NOM.SG.M	PRT	be:IMP.3SG	

‘This praise song is for you, Varuṇa, you who are of independent will: let it be set within your heart.’ RV 7.86.8ab

As I do not know what the function of *cid* is here, I cannot determine how far its scope extends either. The same problem exists for ex. (164) in Section 4.4.

Thus far, I have adduced several syntactic and semantic criteria which show that cases in which *cid* occurs later in the clause are either in accordance with my hypothesis or at least cannot be regarded as clear counter-evidence. Of the 254 cases in which *cid* does not occur in the second position of its clause, I have now treated 204. This means that 50 attestations are yet to be explained.

With respect to the ‘initial string’, Hock (1996: 246f.) observes that not only can it be placed at the beginning of a clause, but also clause-internally at the beginning of a pāda, i.e. after a metrical boundary. One of the examples he gives is the following:

(331) <i>váhantu</i>	<i>aruṇápsava</i>	/	<i>úpa</i>	<i>tvā</i>
pull:IMP.3PL	with.reddish.breath:NOM.PL.M		LP	2SG.ACC
<i>somíno</i>	<i>grhám</i>			
with.soma:GEN.SG.M	house:ACC.SG.M			

‘Let the (horses) whose breath is reddish convey **you** right to the house of the one who has soma.’ RV 1.49.1cd

I find one case in which *cid* occurs in the second position after a hemistich boundary and 6 cases in which it occurs after a simple pāda boundary:

(332) <i>mánojavasā</i>	<i>vṛṣaṇā</i>	<i>madacyutā</i>	/
swift.as.thought:INS.SG.M	bull:VOC.DU.M	roused.to.exuberance:VOC.DU.M	
<i>makṣuṃgamábhīr</i>	<i>ūtíbhīh</i>	<i>ārátātāc</i>	<i>cid</i>
coming.quickly:INS.PL.F	help:INS.PL.F	from.far	PRT

³⁶⁸ As I have mentioned above, I analyze *cid* also in ex. (56) in Section 4.1, where it occurs in a question, as a beneath operator.

bhūtam *asmé* *ávase* / *pūrvībhiḥ*
 become:AOR.IMP.2DU 1PL.LOC help:DAT.SG.N many:INS.PL.F

purubhojasā
 with.many.benefits:VOC.DU.M

‘With (your chariot) swift as thought, o bulls roused to exuberance, with your forms of help that come quickly, **even** from far away come to be here for our help with your many (forms of help), you who bring many benefits.’ RV 8.22.16

(333) *ádha* *dyaús* *cit* *te* *ápa* *sá* *nú*
 then heaven:NOM.SG.M PRT 2SG.GEN LP DEM:NOM.SG.F now

vájrād / *dvitānamad* *bhiyāsā* *svásya*
 mace:ABL.SG.M doubly+bow:IPRF.3SG fear:INS.SG.F own:GEN.SG.M

manyóḥ / *áhiṃ* *yád* *índro* *abhí*
 fury:GEN.SG.M serpent:ACC.SG.M when Indra:NOM.SG.M LP

óhasānam / *ní* *cid* *viśváyuḥ*
 vaunting:ACC.SG.M LP PRT full.lifespan:ACC.SG.N

śayáthe *jaghāna*
 lair:LOC.SG.N hit:PERF.3SG

‘Then even Heaven, she [=Earth] likewise also, bent away from your mace, through fear of your own battle fury, when Indra **even** struck down the vaunting serpent to lie there for a full lifespan’³⁶⁹ RV 6.17.9

In ex. (332), the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1075) suggests that the instrumentals in pāda b might not be within the scope of *cid* anyway, but assuming that the second position in the hemistich is comparable to the second position of the clause would also account for an interpretation in which they are in the scope of *cid*. In (333), the whole temporal subclause is in the scope of *cid*. In addition to the observations by Hock (1996), it is also noteworthy that in the interpretation of local particles clause boundaries and pāda boundaries are treated alike as well (cf. Section 5.9). Interestingly, Hock (1996: 248–251) finds the initial string also after smaller metrical boundaries within a pāda, namely after the caesura and in the first position of the cadence. The cadence is constituted by the last four or five syllables of a pāda; pādas with eleven or twelve syllables also exhibit a caesura after the fourth or fifth syllable (Macdonell 1916: 436). For a more detailed description see Arnold (1905: 10–13; 179–182; 185f.). Hock (1996: 249f.) gives the following examples for the initial string after the caesura and in the beginning of a cadence:

(334) *apām* *tokásya* *tánayasya* *jeśá* /
 water:GEN.PL.F progeny:GEN.SG.N lineage:GEN.SG.N winning:LOC.SG.M

³⁶⁹ The translation deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

ín₁dra₂ *sū₃rín₄* / *kṛṇuhí* *smā* *no*
 Indra:VOC.SG.M patron:ACC.PL.M do:IMP.2SG PRT 1PL.GEN

ardhám
 half:ACC.SG.M

‘Go halves with **our** patrons, Indra, in the conquering of the waters, of life and lineage.’
 RV 6.44.18cd

(335) *vidā́* *gādhám* / *tu₁cé₂* *tú₃* *naḥ₄*
 find:AOR.SBJV.2SG ground:ACC.SG.N progeny:DAT.SG.F PRT 1PL.GEN

‘Find a ford for **our** progeny.’ 6.48.9d

Even though he finds these patterns, he states that they are rather uncommon, the initial string in the cadence even more than in the caesura. Yet, I find these patterns also with *cid*, where its host occupies the first position after the caesura and in the cadence:

(336) *ā́₁* *vo₂* *yā́₃mā́₄ya₅* / *pṛthiví* *cid*
 LP 2PL.GEN journey:DAT.SG.M earth:NOM.SG.F PRT
ásrod / *ábībhayanta* *mānuṣāḥ*
 hear:AOR.3SG fear:AOR.MID.3PL son.of.Mānu:NOM.PL.M

‘**Even** the earth has listened for your journey and the sons of Manu have become afraid.’
 RV 1.39.6cd

(337) *sá* *savyéna* *yamati* /
 DEM:NOM.SG.M left:INS.SG.M hold:AOR.SBJV.3SG
vrā́₁dha₂ta₃ *cit₄*
 overweening:ACC.PL.M PRT

‘He with his left (hand) will hold fast **even** the overweening (foes)’ 1.100.9a

In both cases, *cid* takes scope over the entire clause and its host occurs after the caesura and in the first position of the cadence, respectively. I find 21 cases of *cid* occurring in the second position after the caesura and 4 cases of *cid* occurring in the second position of the cadence. The beginning of the cadence need not coincide with a word boundary, but in the 4 passages I subsume in this group, the first syllable of the host of *cid* is the first syllable of the cadence.³⁷⁰

Adding to the 204 cases in which I adduced syntactic and semantic criteria to account for the position of *cid* the cases in which it occurs after a metrical boundary, this results in 236 cases. This means that there are 18 cases left, for which I do not have any explanation.³⁷¹ One such clear counterexample is the following sentence which occurs after several great deeds that Indra did in the past are mentioned:

³⁷⁰ Among the 21 cases in which *cid* occurs in the second position after a caesura is also RV 5.33.4c. There, the caesura is after the third syllable, i.e. it is a weak caesura (see Arnold 1905: 179f.; 191f.).

³⁷¹ One of these cases, RV 2.11.7, might actually be regarded as a case where *cid* takes the second position after a prosodic boundary. It occurs in a pāda with ten syllables and (Arnold 1905: 298) assumes that its host is preceded by a rest. See, however, Oldenberg (1906: 745–755) on this matter.

(338)	<i>yád</i>	<i>adyá</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>kṛṇávaḥ</i>	<i>kás</i>	<i>tuvā</i>	<i>pári</i>
	if	today	PRT	do:SBJV.2SG	who:NOM.SG.M	2SG.ACC	LP

‘If you will **also** do (such) today, who (will evade) you?’ RV 1.54.5d

With respect to a passage in which the enclitic pronoun *tvā* ‘you’ also occurs after the clause-initial sequence *yád adyá*, Lowe (2014: 8f.) states that “*tvā* unambiguously follows the second constituent, and so must be interpreted as the third syntactic element in the clause”. Accordingly, the same has to be said about *cid* in ex. (338), where no prosodic boundary is present before its host either. Nonetheless, the scope of *cid* should contain the whole subordinate clause.

What does this analysis mean for the syntactic behavior of *cid*? I began this section with the hypothesis that the syntactic position of *cid* correlates with its scope, i.e. when it occurs in Wackernagel position its scope contains the whole clause, whereas when it occurs later its scope is smaller than the clause. Of the 595 instances of *cid* that I have consulted for my investigation, only 50 instances, i.e. 8.4% are not in accordance with the hypothesis. The other cases are either in accordance with the hypothesis or are unclear according to the criteria that I have adduced. However, the ratio is different when one only takes into account those cases which are according to my hypothesis unambiguous, i.e. those in which *cid* does not occur in second position. This only leaves a ratio of 50 out of 254 cases, which means that 19.7% of the cases are not in accordance with my hypothesis. Yet another factor that has to be taken into account is that among these 50, there are 32 in which *cid* occurs in the second position after a metrical boundary. This confirms again the affinity of this particle to the second position, be it the second position of a syntactic unit or a metrical unit. I am not certain, however, whether these second positions really mark the scope of this particle. Especially the fact that it occurs more often in the second position after the caesura than in the second position of the *pāda* seems suspicious.

Even if one disregards metrical boundaries as potential indicators of the scope of *cid*, my investigation has shown that although the numbers are not absolute, there appears to be a correlation between a late position of *cid* and a smaller scope. Only in 19.7% of the cases where *cid* occurs late can it clearly be assigned a scope that comprises the whole clause.

4.11 Summary

In this major section, I have investigated the functions of the particle *cid* in the Rigveda. Section 4.1 was dedicated to its functions as an additive particle. I found that it is used as a general additive operator with no apparent restrictions with respect to the lexical class or the syntactic

category of its focus, which may contain one or more words. It usually occurs after its focus, or after the first word of its focus, but there are also cases which deviate from this pattern. Both its focus and the alternatives can be mentioned in the previous or following discourse but this does not have to be the case.

In Section 4.2, I examined cases in which two or more instances of *cid* occur in relative proximity to each other. This revealed another important fact regarding the semantics of *cid*, which I examined in 4.1, namely that as a scalar operator it does not mark an extreme point on a scale, which means that it is a relative scalar particle. In addition to this scalar use, I found that multiple instances of *cid* are employed to express free-choice disjunction and emphatic coordination, the latter of which can also be expressed by a single *cid*. When *cid* occurs in coordinated clauses, it should be analyzed as an additive focus particle and not as a conjunction. I do, however assume that single *cid* can function as a discourse marker when it is associated with the entire clause in its scope. When it follows the connectives *utó* (*utá u*) and *ádha*, its function is difficult to determine.

In Section 4.3, I examined two things. The first one was the indefinite proforms formed by interrogatives and *cid*. I have shown that *ká-cid* can be used as a specific indefinite, possibly as an unspecific indefinite, as a universal and free-choice quantifier, and as a negative indefinite when it occurs within the scope of negation. In addition to pronouns, the Rigveda also contains indefinite adverbs. The second point that I investigated in this section was the combination of *cid* with the adverb *nú* ‘now’, which can have a positive meaning ‘even now’ but also an opaque negative meaning ‘never’. After noticing how problematic this ambiguity can be, I attempted to establish a clear syntactic distribution, namely initial position → negative vs. non-initial position → positive. However, after analyzing the data I found that there was one clear counterexample to my hypothesis. Instead, I have argued that it is actually the position with respect to the predicate which appears to be the relevant criterion: When *nú cid* occurs before the predicate it is negative, when it occurs after the predicate it is positive.

Section 4.4 was dedicated to contexts in which the function of *cid* resembles that of universal quantification, which several scholars have assumed for *cid* even without a preceding interrogative proform. Based on the comparison with the particle *api* in younger Sanskrit and with additive particles in other languages, I argued for a totalizing function for *cid* after numerals, universal quantifiers and other forms. I furthermore argued that in none of these cases does *cid* actually quantify over a set of entities and that also in the passages that Grassmann (1873: 455) gives for ‘generalizing’ *cid* it can be interpreted differently. I also argued that the

presence of *cid* in those passages where it follows *purá* can best be explained by its totalizing function.

In Section 4.5, I argued for the interpretation of *cid* as a degree modifier after vague quantifiers but also after property-denoting nominals, even though at times the distinction between this and a scalar additive use can be difficult. I argued that German *gar* can be viewed as a parallel because it can serve both as an additive particle and as a degree modifier as well.

Section 4.6 provided an extensive investigation of concessive constructions. It was shown that *cid* occurs in the three subtypes of concessive conditionals, namely universal, scalar and reduced alternative concessive conditionals. These constructions are not always easy to distinguish from other types like non-specific free relative clauses. I argued that *yád cid (hí)* clauses are to be interpreted as concessive conditionals rather than proper conditional clauses, which is in accordance with Lühr (1997). However, contrary to Lühr (1997), I argued that *cid* alone does not mark scalar concessive conditional clauses but that this is only possible in combination with a conjunction. In addition to concessive circumstantial clauses I also examined concessive circumstantial secondary predicates. I found that *cid* can but need not mark a concessive relation between the secondary and the main predicate. With respect to the one case in which *cid* follows an absolute, i.e. a converb, the interpretation is difficult.

In Section 4.7 I examined several cases in which *cid* has been considered to function as a particularizer. For these cases, I argued that such an interpretation is possible but not certain. I am therefore indecisive whether or not such a function should be postulated for *cid*.

In contrast, Section 4.8 showed clear cases where *cid* exhibits several of the functions that I will show for *íd* in Section 5 such as scalar and non-scalar exclusive function, marking exhaustive focus, emphatic assertion of identity, an intensificatory function and decreasing the tolerance for deviations. I even found *cid* and *íd* with similar function used in relative proximity to each other.

Section 4.9 was dedicated to an alleged function which was assigned to *cid* by Yāska but which has been doubted in more recent literature, namely that of a comparative particle. I argued that in all cases where Geldner (1951–1957) assigns it such a function, another interpretation is possible. Therefore, I reject the assumption that *cid* has this function.

Section 4.10 was concerned with the syntactic behavior of *cid*. I formulated the hypothesis that the position of *cid* correlates with its scope in that a position late in the clause indicates restricted scope. I was not able to confirm this hypothesis but nevertheless I found a tendency towards smaller scope in later position. Moreover, I found that in the cases that are not in

accordance with my hypothesis, there is at least an affinity towards the second position after a metrical boundary.

With respect to the different functions of *cid*, it is sometimes difficult to determine the relation between them, at least at first sight. Nevertheless, typological studies such as Forker (2016) show that it is not unusual for an additive particles to be polyfunctional.

5 The employment of *íd* in the Rigveda

This section is concerned with a detailed analysis of the particle *íd* in the Rigveda. Etymologically, *íd* is the NOM/ACC.SG.N **í-d* of a demonstrative stem but synchronically it functions as a particle (Mayrhofer 1992–2001: I, 190; Dunkel 2014: 374–377).³⁷² It is attested 809 times in the Rigveda and depending on the following word, it can occur in the sandhi forms *íd*, *ít*, *íj*, *íc* or *ín*.³⁷³ This particle has been interpreted in different ways in the literature. The ancient Indian grammarian Yāska analyzes it as an expletive particle (Sarup 1967: 12). Likewise, Arnold (1905: 73) contends that *íd* served in many cases primarily to avoid hiatus. Like Benfey (1866: 100) and Hillebrandt (1885: 77), Speyer (1896: 70) and Thumb & Hauschild (1958–1959: II, 144) classify it as an emphatic particle, and the latter assume in addition that it has been replaced by *evá* in the younger language. For as Macdonell (1916: 218) notes, whereas *íd* is used often in the Rigveda, its frequency decreases in the Atharvaveda and it occurs only seldom in the Brāhmaṇas. Geldner (1907–1909: I, 27f.) considers *íd* to be an equivalent of *evá* as well. Following Renou (1952: 375), the function of *íd* only partially overlaps with that of *evá*, but he finds the other functions difficult to determine. According to Speyer (1896: 70), *íd* emphasizes a single word. Ludwig (1876–1888: VI, 102) describes *íd* as restrictive (“beschränkend”). Cappeller (1891: 74) and Lanman (1912: 129), who translate it as ‘just, exactly, even’, consider *íd* to emphasize the preceding word. Rodríguez Adrados (1992: 178) translates it as ‘precisely’ (‘precisamente’). Following Benfey (1852–1854: II, 48), the emphatic use is observable in particular after pronouns (cp. Bopp 1847: 38; Bopp 1868–1871: II, 170). Böhtlingk & Roth (1855–1875: I, 793), who translate it as ‘eben, gerade; selbst, sogar; nur’ also observe a regular occurrence after prepositions and particles at the beginning of a clause.³⁷⁴ Like Delbrück (1874: 56), they observe that *íd* is used to express contrast. Pott (1879: 61) translates it as ‘gerade, eben gls. das ist’s’. Macdonell (1893: 45) gives ‘just, quite, even, only’ as possible translations. Monier-Williams (1899: 165), who gives similar translations for *íd*, characterizes it as “a particle of affirmation”, and adds to the possible translations ‘even’, ‘just’ and ‘only’ the further translations ‘indeed’ and ‘assuredly’. Similarly, Apte (1957–1959: I, 382) states that it is used “especially in strengthening a statement”. Accordingly, RIVELEX (II, 157) renders it as ‘indeed, really’. Even though Delbrück (1888: 495), following Grassmann (1873: 205f.), also assumes that *íd* emphasizes the preceding word, he (1888: 22) observes that *íd* and other stressed particles may emphasize the whole proposition (“den Satzgedanken”) (cf.

³⁷² On the hypothesis that *íd* might reflect **i-t*, with an alleged instrumental ending **-t* see Scarlata (1999: 42).

³⁷³ The number of attestations includes 4 instances of *céd* (*ca íd*) (RV 7.72.4; 8.79.5; 10.109.3; 10.146.5) and 4 instances of *néd* (*ná íd*) (RV 5.79.9; 8.5.39; 10.16.7; 10.51.4), which I do not include in my study (see below).

³⁷⁴ Osthoff (1881: 230) gives the same German particles as possible translations.

also Renou 1952: 375). According to Grassmann (1873: 205f.) a major function of *íd* is to indicate that what is said about the word it emphasizes is true although it is unexpected. As one of its functions, he also observes that it can emphasize universal quantification. Apart from the translations that I have given thus far, dictionaries and glossaries often remark that *íd* can be rendered by stressing the word with which it is associated. Following Gaedicke (1880: 212) *íd* may occur in corrections. Lehmann (1985: 233) characterizes *íd* as a “topicalizing particle”. Lühr (2010: 142, 2017: 286f.) analyzes it as a stressed focus particle. Moreover, she (2010: 142) analyzes *íd* as a free focus, i.e. as a focus “without an associated element” (Féry 2012: 424). However, Lühr (2017: 286) revises her analysis and states that it is not a free focus. She renders it as ‘especially’. Kozianka (2000: 225) regards *íd* as a discourse particle which marks something as evident and irrevocable (“<EVIDENT, UNABÄNDERLICH>”) rather than as a focus particle (see also Gippert 2004: 56). She compares it to the German discourse particle *eben*. A similar analysis of stressed particles like *íd* is found in Lühr (2009). Similarly to Lühr (2009), who assumes a difference between stressed and unstressed particles in general, Gaedicke (1880: 234) believes that the difference in accentuation between *íd* ‘gerade, eben’ and *cid* ‘sogar selbst’ reflects a difference in their meaning. This appears to be in accordance with the observation by Viti (2007: 38) and Boley (2004: 151) that *íd* after finite verbs has the function of establishing a link between clauses. According to Tichy (1995b: 331), it reinforces the proposition when it occurs after verbs (“verleiht *íd* der Aussage Nachdruck, indem es die Realität der Verbalhandlung bekräftigt”). It also has the ability to cause an accent on a preceding verb (Delbrück 1888: 37). According to Gotō (2013: 150f.), *íd* is a particle that syntactically behaves like an enclitic and is employed for emphasis. According to Klein (2019: 44), *íd* is usually used as an exclusive particle meaning ‘only, just’. Renou (1952: 375) gives ‘c’est lui-même’ and ‘lui seul’ as a translation for *sá íd*, which indicates the use as an intensifier and an exclusive particle. Hillebrandt (1885: 77) notes that it is typical of *íd* to occur together with other particles and Kozianka (2000: 227) even states that *íd* is the particle that is attested in most combinations with other particles. In his discussion of the conjunction *céd* (*ca íd*) ‘when, if’ in the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa, Durkin (1991: 40f.) characterizes *íd* as emphatic and as indicating a deviation or contrast. He tentatively translates it as ‘schließlich’. Moreover, he (1991: 76) explains that *íd* is used to mark the highest point of an explanation and when it occurs with the conjunction *yádi*, this clause is intended to address all remaining questions, which may express impatience. The use of *íd* in the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa is not necessarily indicative of the use in the Rigveda because in the former it is used predominantly in the collocations *céd* and *néd*.

Even though the majority of scholars regards *íd* as a particle, a possible pronominal function has been assumed as well. Whereas Dunkel (2014: 374) states that *íd* occurs only as a particle in Vedic, Kupfer (2002: 323–325) finds remnants of the original pronominal use still in the Rigveda. Pirart (1995: 263) assumes that in some cases *íd* is to be interpreted as an enclitic pronoun, which is accented due to the influence of the accented particle. Without explicitly claiming that *íd* still could be used as a pronoun in the Rigveda, Paczkowski (2012) finds traces of this older usage in the syntactic structure of several Rigvedic passages.

Syntactically, *íd* has been analyzed in the context of Wackernagel elements. Delbrück (1888: 22) distinguishes between three major groups of stressed particles. There are those which can occur in the first position of the clause and there are those which cannot. He further subdivides the second group: On the one hand, there are stressed particles which follow the word they are associated with and thus can occur anywhere in the sentence; on the other hand, there are those which emphasize the meaning of the whole sentence and thus tend to occur in the second position (but never in the first position). He regards *íd* as a member of the second subgroup (see also Canedo 1937: 72f., Kulikov 2017–2018: 398; Schäufole 1988: 134). Contrary to the classification by Delbrück, Lühr (2010: 137f.) correctly observes that *íd* may also occur later in the clause than in the second position (cf. also Hale 1987: 105f.). Therefore, she subsumes it under Hale’s (1987) third group of Wackernagel elements, the group which also contains *cid*. Gippert (2004: 56) describes elements like *íd* as behaving like “quasi-enclitics”. Regarding the position with respect to the word it emphasizes, I have already mentioned that *íd* follows this word according to the literature. Following Lühr (2017: 286), *íd* always occurs adjacent to its focus.

As I have mentioned in my literature review, scholars have observed that *íd* has similar functions to the particle *eva* in younger Sanskrit and it has even been claimed that *eva* has replaced *íd*.³⁷⁵ As with *cid* and *api* I do not make any claims as to the historical relation of *íd* and *eva*, i.e. whether the latter has replaced the former in post-Rigvedic time. Nonetheless, whenever it is useful, I will compare analyses of different functions of *eva* to those of Rigvedic *íd*. Before I begin my analysis, a further comment on my data set is necessary. The Rigveda contains not only simple forms of *íd* but also compounded or lexicalized forms which contain this particle. My study does not include compound forms like the particles *svid* and *kuvíd*, which contain the particle *íd*. I will not examine the conjunctions *céd* (*ca íd*) ‘if’ and *néd* (*ná íd*) ‘lest’

³⁷⁵ I write *eva* without an accent because I refer not only to Vedic but also to Classical Sanskrit. On the functions of *eva* in Vedic and Classical Sanskrit see Monier-Williams (1899: 232), Hartman (1966: 34–40); Ickler (1971: 26–30) Kajiyama (1973), Gren-Eklund (1978: 106–127), Gillon & Hayes (1982), Gillon (1999) and Kobayashi (2012).

either. Note, however, that *céd* and *néd*, each of which is attested 4 times in the Rigveda, are included in the 809 attestations of *íd*.

5.1 *íd* as an exclusive particle

The overview of the literature on *íd* shows that several scholars assign it the function of an exclusive particle. I will begin my investigation by examining this function. I will describe the various readings *íd* can have as an exclusive particle and identify the contexts in which it occurs. Moreover, I will identify a usage of *íd* that is reminiscent of but nevertheless different from its function as an exclusive particle, namely that of marking exhaustive focus.

König (1991: 99f.) explains that similarly to additive particles, exclusive particles can be used in a scalar and non-scalar way as well. The Vedic particle *íd* occurs in both functions, as the following examples show:³⁷⁶

(339) <i>mā</i>	<i>vo</i>	<i>ghnántam</i>		<i>mā</i>
NEG	2PL.ACC	hit:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.SG.M		NEG
<i>śápantam</i>		/	<i>práti</i>	<i>voce</i>
curse:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.SG.M			LP	speak:AOR.INJ.MID.1SG
<i>devayántam</i>		/	<i>sumnaír</i>	íd <i>va</i>
serving.gods:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.SG.M			benevolence:INS.PL.N PRT	2PL.ACC
<i>ā</i>	<i>vivāse</i>			
LP	win:DES.MID.1SG			

‘Let me not respond to the man who smites or curses you, (as if) to one devoted to the gods; by benevolent thoughts **alone** will I seek to win you.’ RV 1.41.8

(340) <i>prá</i>	<i>ririce</i>	<i>divá</i>	<i>índraḥ</i>
LP	release:PERF.MID.3SG	heaven:ABL.SG.M	Indra:NOM.SG.M
<i>pr̥thivyā</i>	/	<i>ardhám</i>	íd <i>asya</i> <i>práti</i>
earth:ABL.SG.F		half:ACC.SG.M	PRT DEM:GEN.SG.M LP
<i>ródasī</i>		<i>ubhé</i>	
world.halves:NOM.DU.F		both:NOM.DU.F	

‘Indra projects beyond heaven and earth: the two worlds are equivalent to **just** half of him.’ RV 6.30.1cd

Ex. (339) is addressed to Varuṇa, Mitra and Aryaman. Here, the poet wants to express that he will have nothing but good thoughts in his mind when he seeks to win them, which means that *íd* excludes everything apart from its focus. Ex. (340) is of a different nature. Here as well, *íd* has an exclusive function because it excludes alternative values to *ardhám asya* ‘half of him’.

³⁷⁶ As stated in Section 3, the text of all Rigvedic passages is adopted from van Nooten & Holland (1994) and all English translations of Rigvedic passages are quoted from Jamison & Brereton (2014), unless otherwise noted.

In contrast to the previous example, these values are ordered on a scale and the values higher than ‘half of him’ (e.g. ‘three quarters of him’) are excluded. The sentence is intended to convey that ‘half of him’ is a particularly low value and that the ‘the two worlds’, i.e. Heaven and Earth cannot compete with Indra. Ex. (341) contains a text passage in which the scalar and the non-scalar functions of *íd* occur directly next to each other:

(341) <i>citra</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>rājā</i>	<i>rājakā</i>	<i>íd</i>
Citra:NOM.SG.M	PRT	king:NOM.SG.M	king:DIM.NOM.PL.M	PRT
<i>anyaké</i>	/	<i>yaké</i>	<i>sárasvatīm</i>	<i>ánu</i>
other:DIM.NOM.PL.M		REL:DIM.NOM.PL.M	Sarasvatī:ACC.SG.F	LP

‘**Only** Citra is the king. The other petty little ones who (live) along the Sarasvatī are **only** kinglets’³⁷⁷ RV 8.21.18ab

In this example, the first instance of *íd* is probably a non-scalar exclusive particle. It excludes all possible alternatives to Citra from having the property of ‘being King’. The relevant alternatives, which are explicitly mentioned in the following sentence, are ‘the other little ones’. They are *rājakā íd* ‘only kinglets’, which means that on a scale of social ranks, higher ranks like ‘king’, are excluded. As a result, the second instance of *íd* is a scalar exclusive particle.

As the examples of the scalar use of *íd* I have shown, all alternatives that are, at least apparently, higher on the scale are excluded. However, with scalar exclusive operators it is also possible that in certain contexts the scale is reversed and the operator excludes the alternatives that are lower on the scale. Consider the following English example by König (1991: 101):

(342) **Only** a MIRACLE can save us (i.e. nothing short of a miracle).

König (1991: 101f.) explains that even though *a miracle* appears to be higher on the scale than its alternatives, it can actually be regarded as lower. Consider now the following examples that König (1991: 102) gives:

(343) a. *Ordinary measures can save us.*

b. *A miracle can save us.*

Ordinary measures appears to be lower on the scale than *a miracle*. Nonetheless, the second sentence follows from the first one: *If ordinary measures can save us then a miracle can save us as well*. Since this is not conditioned purely by the semantics of *ordinary measures* and *a miracle*, König (1991: 102) speaks of “pragmatic entailments” in contexts like this. He explains that such scale reversals are dependent on the context and occur when it has “a generic and conditional quality”, i.e. when it expresses a sufficient condition. If the scope of the exclusive particle contains such a sufficient condition, the high position of its focus on a natural scale (*ordinary measures* < *miracle*) is turned into a low value on the context scale (*miracle* <

³⁷⁷ The translation deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

ordinary measures) (cf. König 1991: 102). Such scale reversal is also attested for Rigvedic *íd*, as the following example shows:

(344) <i>trṣṭám</i> rough:NOM.SG.N	<i>etát</i> DEM:NOM.SG.N	<i>kátukam</i> sharp:NOM.SG.N	<i>etád</i> / DEM:NOM.SG.N
<i>apāṣṭhavad</i> barbed:NOM.SG.N	<i>viṣávan</i> poisonous:NOM.SG.N	<i>naitád</i> NEG+DEM:NOM.SG.N	<i>átave</i> / eat:INF.DAT.SG
<i>sūriyām</i> Sūrya:ACC.SG.F	<i>yó</i> REL:NOM.SG.N	<i>brahmá</i> brahmin:NOM.SG.M	<i>vidyāt</i> / know:PERF.OPT.3SG
<i>sá</i> DEM:NOM.SG.M	<i>íd</i> PRT	<i>vādhūyam</i> bridal:ACC.SG.N	<i>arhati</i> deserve:3SG

‘This is rough; this is sharp, barbed, poisonous: it is not for eating. The brahmin who would know Sūryā, **only** he deserves this thing associated with the bride(groom).’ RV 10.85.34

Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1521) paraphrase the content of this stanza in the following manner: “menace returns in [stanza] 34, where an unidentified object is ascribed all sorts of harmful qualities. Only a brahmin can neutralize them”. Hence, this is a context comparable to the one in the English ex. (342). Being a Brahmin who would know Sūryā is a sufficient condition for deserving the wedding gown and it is the social classes that are ranked lower on the natural scale which are excluded here.

Interesting cases are those which involve stylistic repetition of the focus of *íd*, as the following example:

(345) <i>dákṣiṇāvatām</i> giving.dakṣiṇās:GEN.PL.M	<i>íd</i> PRT	<i>imāni</i> DEM:NOM.PL.N	<i>citrā</i> / brilliant:NOM.PL.N
<i>dákṣiṇāvatām</i> giving.dakṣiṇās:GEN.PL.M	<i>diví</i> heaven:LOC.SG.M	<i>sūriyāsaḥ</i> / sun:NOM.PL.M	
<i>dákṣiṇāvanto</i> giving.dakṣiṇās:NOM.SG.M	<i>amṛtam</i> immortality:ACC.SG.N	<i>bhajante</i> / obtain:MID.3PL	
<i>dákṣiṇāvantah</i> giving.dakṣiṇās:NOM.PL.M	<i>prá</i> LP	<i>tiranta</i> cross:MID.3PL	<i>āyuh</i> lifetime:ACC.SG.N

‘For the givers of dakṣiṇās **only** there are these brilliant (bounties) here; for the givers of dakṣiṇās there are suns in heaven. Givers of dakṣiṇās have a share in immortality; givers of dakṣiṇās lengthen their own lifetime.’ RV 1.125.6

This example exhibits the stylistic device, which in the terminology of Klein (1999) is called NOMINAL ANAPHORA, i.e. each pāda begins with the same nominal. In each hemistich, it is even the same morphological form but across the hemistich boundary the case form changes. The exclusive particle *íd* only occurs in the first pāda. Nevertheless, I assume that the poet intends to convey that the propositions of all pādas hold true only for the givers of *dakṣiṇās*, so that *íd*

has to be supplied in the remaining three pādas. However, this pattern can also be reversed.

Consider the following text passage:

(346) <i>marúdbhir</i>	<i>ugráh</i>	<i>pṛtanāsu</i>	<i>sāḥā</i>	/
Marut:INS.PL.M	strong:NOM.SG.M	battle:LOC.PL.F	victor:NOM.SG.M	
<i>marúdbhir</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>sánitā</i>	<i>vājam</i>	
Marut:INS.PL.M	PRT	winner:NOM.SG.M	prize:ACC.SG.M	
<i>árvā</i>				
running:NOM.SG.M				

‘along with the Maruts the strong one is the victor in battles; **just** along with the Maruts does the charger win the prize.’ RV 7.56.23cd

I do not believe that the poet wants to convey that the charger wins battles only with the help of the Maruts whereas the strong one may also with battles without them. Instead, I assume that the poet considers the help of the Maruts equally necessary in both clauses. Compare this with the following example, where the traits that a man must have to be successful are described:

(347) <i>ṛjúr</i>	<i>íc</i>	<i>cháṃso</i>	<i>vanavad</i>	
straight:NOM.SG.M	PRT	laud:NOM.SG.M	win:SBJV.3SG	
<i>vanuṣyató</i>		/	<i>devayánn</i>	<i>íd</i>
be.eager:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.PL.M			serve.gods:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.M	PRT
<i>ádevayantam</i>	<i>abhy</i>	<i>ásat</i>	/	<i>suprāvīr</i>
not.serving.gods:ACC.SG.M	LP	be:SBJV.3SG		attentive:NOM.SG.M
<i>vanavat</i>	<i>pṛtsú</i>	<i>duṣṭáram</i>	/	
win:SBJV.3SG	battle:LOC.PL.F	hard.to.overcome.:ACC.SG.M		
<i>yájvéd [= yáivā <i>íd</i>]</i>	<i>áyajyor</i>	<i>ví</i>	<i>bhajāti</i>	
sacrificer:NOM.SG.M+PRT	non.sacrificer:GEN.SG.M	LP	apportion:SBJV.3SG	
<i>bhójanam</i>				
sustenance:ACC.SG.N				

‘**Just** he *whose laud is straight (on target) will win against those who seek to win. **Just** he who is devoted to the gods will dominate the one not devoted to the gods. **Just** he who pursues (his ritual duties) well will win against the one difficult to surpass in battles. As sacrificer, he will apportion out the sustenance of the non-sacrificer.’ RV 2.26.1

In all pādas, the subject denotes the sufficient condition in order to accomplish what is described by the predicate and in all instances this sufficient condition is marked by *íd*.

As in the examination of additive *cid* in Section 4.1, I will now go on to examine with which lexical classes exclusive *íd* can be associated (see on this matter also RIVELEX (II, 157)).³⁷⁸ Firstly, it can be associated with nominals, including property-denoting nominals (ex. (348)), entity-denoting nominals (ex. (349)) and proper names (ex. (350)):

(348) <i>imé</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>indra</i>	<i>ródasī</i>
DEM:NOM.DU.F	PRT	Indra:VOC.SG.M	world.halves:NOM.DU.F

³⁷⁸ Krisch does not distinguish between the different functions of *íd*.

<i>apāré</i> boundless:NOM.DU.F	/	<i>yát</i> when	<i>saṃgrbhñā</i> LP.grab:SBJV.2SG	<i>maghavan</i> bounteous:VOC.SG.M
<i>kāśír</i> handful:NOM.SG.M	<i>ít</i> PRT	<i>te</i> 2SG.DAT		

‘Even these two world-halves without limits—when you grabbed them together, bounteous Indra, it was **just** a handful for you.’ RV 3.30.5cd

(349) <i>abhrātrvyó</i> without.rival:NOM.SG.M	<i>anā</i> thus	<i>tuvám</i> 2SG.NOM	/	<i>ánāpir</i> without.friend:NOM.SG.M
<i>indra</i> Indra:VOC.SG.M	<i>janúṣā</i> birth:INS.SG.N	<i>sanād</i> of.old	<i>asi</i> / be:2SG	
<i>yudhéd [= yudhā íd]</i> fight:INS.SG.F+PRT	<i>āpitvám</i> friendship:ACC.SG.N	<i>ichase</i> seek:MID.2SG		

‘You are without rival, but by the same token, without friend, Indra, by birth and from of old. **Only** in battle do you seek friendship.’ RV 8.21.13

(350) <i>índra</i> Indra:NOM.SG.M	<i>íd</i> PRT	<i>rāyáḥ</i> wealth:GEN.SG.M	<i>kṣayati</i> be.master:3SG
<i>prayantā</i> giver:NOM.SG.M			

‘Indra **alone** is master of wealth and will provide it.’ RV 1.51.14d

On *íd* after numerals see Section 5.4.1. Exclusive *íd* also occurs with pronouns, among these personal pronouns (ex. (351)), demonstrative pronouns (ex. (352)) and relative pronouns (ex. (353)):

(351) <i>túbhyéd [= túbhya íd]</i> 2SG.DAT+PRT	<i>eté</i> DEM:NOM.PL.M	<i>bahulā</i> ample:NOM.PL.M
<i>ádrídugdhās</i> milked.by.stone:NOM.PL.M	/	<i>camūśadaś</i> in.cup:NOM.PL.M
<i>indrāpānāḥ</i> drink.for.Indra:NOM.PL.M		<i>camasā</i> beaker:NOM.PL.M

‘For you **alone** are these ample beakers, milked by stones and resting in cups—the draughts of Indra.’ RV 1.54.9ab

(352) <i>ágne</i> Agni:VOC.SG.M	<i>yám</i> REL:ACC.SG.M	<i>yajñám</i> sacrifice:ACC.SG.M	<i>adhvarám</i> / rite:ACC.SG.M
<i>viśvátaḥ</i> all.around	<i>paribhūr</i> surrounding:NOM.SG.M	<i>ási</i> / be:2SG	<i>sá</i> DEM:NOM.SG.M
<i>devésu</i> god:LOC.PL.M	<i>gachati</i> go:3SG		<i>íd</i> PRT

‘O Agni, the sacrifice and rite that you surround on every side—it **alone** goes among the gods.’ RV 1.1.4

(353) <i>yá</i> REL:NOM.PL.M	<i>ít</i> PRT	<i>tád</i> DEM:ACC.SG.N	<i>vidús</i> know:PERF.3PL
---------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------

<i>té</i>	<i>amṛtatvám</i>	<i>ānaśuḥ</i>
DEM:NOM.PL.M	immortality:ACC.SG.N	reach:PERF.3PL

‘**only** those who know this have reached immortality.’ RV 1.164.23d

In addition to nominals and pronouns, *íd* can also have an exclusive function when it is associated with adverbs, as the following example shows:

(354) <i>etaú</i>	<i>me</i>	<i>gāvau</i>	<i>pramarásya</i>
DEM:NOM.DU.M	1SG.DAT	ox:NOM.DU.M	death:GEN.SG.M
<i>yuktaú</i>	/	<i>mó</i>	<i>śú</i> <i>prá</i> <i>sedhīr</i>
yoke:PPP.NOM.DU.M		NEG+PRT	PRT LP drive.off:AOR.INJ.2SG
<i>múhur</i>	<i>ín</i>	<i>mamandhi</i>	
for.a.moment	PRT	wait:IMP.2SG	

‘These two oxen of the Pulverizer [=old age? death?] have been yoked for me. Do not drive (them) forth; wait **just** an instant.’ RV 10.27.20ab

The particle *íd* also occurs after finite verbs and local particles. On its usages in these contexts see Sections 5.8 and 5.9. Moreover, *íd* occurs after the conjunctions *yád* ‘if, when’, *yadā* ‘when’ and *yádi* ‘if, when’. However, it is not clear whether it has exclusive function in these cases. See Section 5.3 on this matter. Regarding the foci with which *íd* may occur, there does not seem to be a further restriction regarding the syntactic category. In ex. (350), it occurs with a subject, in ex. (349), it occurs with an adjunct. In ex. (348), it occurs with a nominal predicate. In the following example, it occurs with a direct object:

(355) <i>ná</i>	<i>vá</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>devāḥ</i>	<i>kṣúdham</i>	<i>íd</i>
NEG	PRT	PRT	god:NOM.PL.M	hunger:ACC.SG.F	PRT
<i>vadhám</i>		<i>dadur</i>	/	<i>utāśitam</i>	<i>úpa</i>
deadly:ACC.SG.M		give:PERF.3PL		also+eat:PPP:ACC.SG.M	LP
<i>gachanti</i>	<i>mṛtyávaḥ</i>				
go:3PL	death:NOM.PL.M				

‘Indeed, the heavenly ones have not given hunger **alone** as a cause of death. Death comes even to the sated one.’ (Klein 1985b: 415) RV 10.117.1ab

This example furthermore shows that exclusive *íd* can occur not only in positive polarity but also within the scope of negation.

For the additive particle *cid*, I showed in Section 4.1 that its focus is usually the preceding word but it also may be larger. This is also the case for *íd*. In ex. (355) above, the focus is only the preceding nominal *kṣúdham* ‘hunger’, whose alternatives are other causes of death, as pāda b of this example shows. In the following example, the focus comprises a complex nominal expression:

(356) <i>viśvo</i>	<i>hí</i>	<i>anyó</i>	<i>arír</i>	<i>ājagāma</i>	/
all:NOM.SG.M	for	other:NOM.SG.M	stranger:NOM.SG.M	LP.go:PERF.3SG	

<i>máméd</i> [= <i>máma íd</i>]	<i>áha</i>	<i>śvásuro</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>jagāma</i>
1SG.GEN+PRT	PRT	father.in.law:NOM.SG.M	NEG+LP	go:PERF.3SG

‘While every other stranger has come here, **only** my father-in-law has not come here.’
RV 10.28.1ab

In this passage, Indra’s daughter-in-law is worried because Indra is not present at the sacrifice (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1417f.). It becomes clear from the context that the focus of *íd* is the entire nominal expression *máma śvásuras* ‘my father-in-law’ and not only the preceding word *máma* ‘my’ because pāda a contains the overt alternatives *viśvas anyás arís* ‘every other stranger’.³⁷⁹ Hence, the speaker does not talk about her father-in-law as opposed to someone else’s father-in-law but the alternatives are other people in general. The predicate is probably in the background because it is identical with the one in pāda a. The contrast between the overt alternatives is furthermore marked by the particle *áha* (Hejib 1984: 98; 125). Notice that in the nominal expression that constitutes the focus of *íd* the stressed pronominal form *máma* is used instead of the enclitic form *me*. This indicates that even though the entire complex nominal expression constitutes the focus, the genitive of the first person receives special emphasis here.³⁸⁰

Another passage where more than one word is in focus is ex. (353) above. There, the entire relative clause in which the particle occurs is in focus. In Section 4.2, I showed that also a main clause can be the focus of *cid* and I argued that in this case it functions as a discourse marker. The next example contains a passage in which *íd* can have a main clause as its focus:

(357) <i>akṣaír</i>	<i>má</i>	<i>dīvyah</i>	<i>kṛṣím</i>	<i>ít</i>
dice:INS.PL.M	NEG	throw:INJ.2SG	plowland:ACC.SG.F	PRT
<i>kṛṣasva</i>		<i>vitté</i>	<i>ramasva</i>	<i>bahú</i>
plow:IMP.MID.2SG		gain:PPP.LOC.SG.N	enjoy:IMP.MID.2SG	much:ACC.SG.N
<i>mányamānah</i>				
think:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M				

‘Don’t keep playing with dice; **just** plow your plowland. Be content in your possessions, thinking them much.’³⁸¹ RV 10.34.13ab

In this example, I consider it to be unlikely that the focus of *íd* is only the preceding nominal and that the second clause means ‘plow nothing but your plowland’.³⁸² Rather, the entire second clause is an alternative to the first clause. What is said in pāda b shows that plowing one’s land

³⁷⁹ The interpretation of this nominal expression is debatable (Schnaus 2008: 204). I follow Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1419) and Jamison (comm.X.1: ad loc.).

³⁸⁰ Jamison (comm.X.1: ad loc.) appears to assume that the particles emphasize only the pronoun and not the entire nominal expression. As I have explained, the context does not suggest this interpretation.

³⁸¹ The translation deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

³⁸² Perhaps the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1431) is intended to express focus on the nominal: ‘just plow your own plowland’.

is considered to be not very profitable compared to the wealth one may win when gambling. As a result, *íd* appears to have a scalar component here. It is the higher ranked, i.e. (potentially) more profitable, alternative which is excluded here. Following König (1991: 110), exclusive particles share the functions of adversative markers when their focus is the entire clause (cf. also Brinton 2006: 316). This is also the case in ex. (357). In the English translation, ‘just’ may well be replaced with ‘but’, as Macdonell ([n.d.]: 90) does: ‘Play not with dice, but cultivate thy tillage’.

As is the case with *cid*, there are also passages which suggest an interpretation in which the focus of *íd* follows the particle. Consider the following example:

(358) <i>yé</i>	<i>vāṃ</i>	<i>dāṃsāṃsi</i>	<i>aśvinā</i>	/
REL:NOM.PL.M	2DU.GEN	wondrous.power:ACC.PL.N	Aśvin:VOC.DU.M	
<i>vīprāsaḥ</i>	<i>parimāṃśúḥ</i>	/	<i>evét [evá <i>íd</i>]</i>	
inspired:NOM.PL.M	LP.touch:PERF.3PL		SO+PRT	
<i>kāṇvāsya</i>	<i>bodhatam</i>			
son.of.Kaṇva:GEN.SG.M	be.aware:AOR.IMP.2DU			

‘(There are) inspired poets who have fondled your wondrous powers all over, o Aśvins—even so, take note **only** of the son of Kaṇva.’ RV 8.9.3

This is a difficult matter. The context certainly justifies interpreting *kāṇvāsya* ‘of the son of Kaṇva’ as the focus of *íd*. He is a poet and therefore the poets mentioned in the first hemistich constitute overt alternatives that are excluded from the attention of the Aśvins. However, the structure in ex. (358) is reminiscent of, albeit not identical to, the one in ex. (383) of Section 5.2, where I assume *íd* to be used as an identifier after *evá* ‘so’. Even though I agree with the observation that *íd* is usually associated with the preceding word, in several cases like ex. (358), it cannot be decided without any doubt which interpretation is correct. However, my analyses of *íd* in the following sections will all be based on the assumption that its focus comprises, or contains, the preceding word.

With respect to the additive particle *cid*, I have also shown in Section 4.1 that its focus can but need not be mentioned in the previous discourse. This is the case for *íd* as well. Consider first the following passage:

(359) <i>ahám</i>	<i>hí</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>harivo</i>	<i>bráhma</i>
1SG.NOM	PRT	2SG.GEN	with.bays:VOC.SG.M	formulation:ACC.SG.N
<i>vājayúr</i>		/	<i>ājīm</i>	<i>yámi</i>
prize.seeking:NOM.SG.M			contest:ACC.SG.F	go:1SG
<i>sádotíbhīḥ</i>		/	<i>tuvām</i>	<i>íd</i>
always+help:INS.PL.F			2SG.ACC	PRT
<i>áme</i>	<i>sám</i>	<i>aśvayúr</i>	/	<i>gavyúr</i>
serve:MID.1SG	LP	seeking.horses:NOM.SG.M		seeking.cows:NOM.SG.M

ágre *mathīnām*
beginning:LOC.SG.N raid:GEN.PL.M

‘For I, seeking the prize, enter the contest for the sacred formulation always with your help, you of the fallow bays. Seeking horses, seeking cows, I pledge myself **just** to you, at the beginning of raids.’ RV 8.53.8

Here, the focus of *íd* is the second person pronoun *tvām*, referring to Indra. The second person pronoun also occurs in the preceding hemistich in the form of the enclitic genitive *te*, as does the vocative *harivas* ‘with fallow bays’, which is used to address Indra. There are also cases in which the focus of *íd* does not occur in the previous context and cannot be inferred either. This is illustrated by the following example:

(360) *utá* *ghā* *némo* *ástutaḥ* / *púmāṁ*
and PRT other:NOM.SG.M unpraised:NOM.SG.M man:NOM.SG.M

íti *bruve* *pañih* / *sá*
QUOT speak:MID.3SG niggard:NOM.SG.M DEM:NOM.SG.M

váiradeya *ít* *samáḥ*
wergeld:LOC.SG.N PRT same:NOM.SG.M

‘And some other guy, a niggard not deserving praise, (may be) called a “man,” but he is **only** equivalent (to a man) in the matter of wergeld.’ RV 5.61.8

In ex. (360), the focus of *íd* is *váiradeye* ‘in wergeld’, which is the only attestation of this lexeme in the Rigveda (Lubotsky 1997: 1366). Lühr (2010: 142) observes that with a personal pronoun, stressed particles like *íd* enhance the givenness of the referent.³⁸³ Ex. (360), where it follows an entity-denoting nominal, clearly shows that such a function is not present in all the attestations of *íd*. What exx. (359) and (360) furthermore show is that the alternatives to the focus of *íd* need not be mentioned overtly in the near context either. However, the alternatives can be mentioned overtly in the previous or in the following discourse, as the next examples show:

(361) *yó* *no* *agne* *’bhidāsati* / *ánti*
REL:NOM.SG.M 1PL.ACC Agni:VOC.SG.M LP.assail:3SG nearby

dūré *padīṣṭá* *sáh* / *asmākam* *íd*
distance:LOC.SG.N fall:AOR.OPT.3SG DEM:NOM.SG.M 1PL.GEN PRT

ṛdhé *bhava*
strengthening:DAT.SG.F be:IMP.2SG

‘Whoever will assail us, close by or in the distance, let him fall, o Agni. Be (ready) to strengthen **only** us.’ RV 1.79.11

(362) *ghóṣā* *íd* *asya* *śṛṇvire* *ná*
sound:NOM.PL.M PRT DEM:GEN.SG.M hear:PERF.MID.3PL NEG

³⁸³ See also the study of the similar particle *evá* in younger Vedic by Kobayashi (2012).

rūpām
form:NOM.S.G.N

‘**Only** his sounds are heard, not his form.’ RV 10.168.4c

Pāda c of ex. (361) contains the request that Agni strengthen us and nobody else. The previous pādas contain an explicit alternative, namely our enemies, whom Agni is asked not to help. Ex. (362) describes properties of Vāta, the god of the wind. More specifically, it says that the sound of the wind can be heard and it explicitly excludes the form as a possible alternative.

Note that ex. (362) is somewhat peculiar because ‘his form’ is unexpected to occur within a set of things that can be heard. Examples like these raise the question of whether *íd* is really used as an exclusive particle here or whether its primary function is different. Consider the following example from Colloquial Burmese given by Ozerov (2014: 144), the structure of which is similar to exx. (339) and (362):

(363) a. *tɛouʔ* *θəmì-kò* *ju-mé* *θu-ha* *ɛwe*
1 daughter-OBJ take-IRR\REL 3-DTOP gold
ɛí=p^hó=lê *mə-lo-p^hù*
have=PURP=ADD NEG-need-NEG₂

‘The person who will marry my daughter – he does not need **to have gold.**’

b. *ŋwe* *ɛí=p^hó=lê* *mə-lo-p^hù*
silver have=PURP=ADD NEG-need-NEG₂

‘[He] does not need **to have silver.**’

c. *θăi-weiʔza* *p^hjiʔ=phó=p^hè* *lo-tɛ*
martial.arts-expert be=PURP=FOC need-R

‘[He] needs {**to be a martial arts expert**}_{p^hè}’

Ozerov (2014: 144) shows that *p^hè* has an exclusive function. Yet, in this example he characterizes the use of *p^hè* as contrastive and describes this as a special case where “the contrastive element replaces a parallel element in a negated clause”. Nevertheless, I believe it is justified to speak of an exclusive use of *íd* in exx. (361) and (362). Firstly, the alternative values are in fact excluded. In the former example the enemies are not to be supported and in the latter example the form is not heard. This can also be seen by the presence of the exclusive particle *only* the English. Secondly, especially in ex. (362), it is not only the overt alternative ‘form’ which is excluded but probably also all other potential alternatives. For nothing but sound can be heard. The same is possibly true of ex. (361), although here it is not clear whether the poet actually wants Agni to support nobody but him and his associates or whether his request only excludes the enemies. Consider furthermore ex. (339) above. There, the alternatives are not presented in an exactly parallel fashion to the focus of *íd* as in exx. (361) and (362), but they can be inferred directly from the context. The participles *ghnántam* ‘smiting’ and *sápantam*

‘cursing’ are opposed to *sumnaís* ‘by good intentions’, which is the focus of *íd*. Hence, the alternative of ‘by benevolent thoughts’ which is excluded is probably by malevolent thoughts or actions’. As in ex. (362), I assume that *íd* excludes not only this but also all other alternatives: ‘By benevolent thoughts and by nothing else will I seek to win you’. That I interpret *íd* as exclusive here does not mean that I deny that it signals a contrast between its focus and the overt alternatives. On the contrary, when the alternatives are explicitly excluded whereas the focus is included this automatically creates a contrast between them (Martínez 2014: 18).

Yet, even though I assume *íd* to have exclusive function in the cases discussed, there are also cases in which its function appears to be primarily contrastive rather than exclusive. Consider the following passage:

(364) <i>ásvo</i> horse:NOM.SG.M	<i>vólhā</i> puller:NOM.SG.M	<i>sukhám</i> well.rolling:ACC.SG.M	
<i>ráthaṃ</i> chariot:ACC.SG.M	/ <i>hasanām</i> joke:ACC.SG.F	<i>upamantrīṇaḥ</i> beguiler:NOM.PL.F	/
<i>śépo</i> penis:NOM.SG.M	<i>rómaṇvantau</i> hairy:ACC.DU.M	<i>bhedaú</i> cleft:ACC.DU.M	/
<i>vár</i> water:ACC.SG.N	<i>ín</i> PRT	<i>maṇḍúka</i> frog:NOM.SG.M	<i>ichati</i> seek:3SG

‘The draft-horse seeks an easy-rolling chariot, beguilers a joke; the penis seeks the hairy split, the frog **just** seeks water.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1364)

‘ ..., the frog seeks water. ’ (my adaptation) RV 9.112.4a–d

I assume that pāda d is not intended to convey that the frog seeks nothing but water because in addition to water frogs need food to survive, which is therefore another thing that they seek. Instead, I assume *íd* to express a contrast between water and the things that the chariot, the beguilers and the penis seek. Hence, Böhtlingk & Roth (1855–1875: I, 793) are correct in perceiving the expression of contrast as a primary function of *íd*. This contrastive use of *íd* is also found when the alternatives are not overtly mentioned:

(365) <i>puruhūtám</i> much.invoked:ACC.SG.M	[...]	<i>índra</i> Indra:NOM.SG.M	<i>íti</i> QUOT	<i>bravītana</i> / speak:IMP.2PL
<i>índra</i> Indra:NOM.SG.M	<i>ín</i> PRT	<i>no</i> 1PL.DAT	<i>mahānām</i> great:GEN.PL.M	/ <i>dātā</i> giver:NOM.SG.M
<i>vājānām</i> prize:GEN.PL.M	<i>nṛtúḥ</i> dancer:NOM.SG.M			

‘2. Much-invoked, [...]—call him, “Indra!”

3. **It’s** Indra **who** is the giver to us of great prizes, the dancer.’ RV 8.92.2–3b

In this example, it seems odd to interpret *íd* as an exclusive particle, which is also reflected in the translations. For instance, Geldner (1951–1957: II, 415) leaves it untranslated.³⁸⁴ Nevertheless, it seems that the properties of being the giver of great prizes and being the dancer are assigned to nobody else but Indra. In order to account for this, a comparison with the Hindi particle *hii* is useful. Varma (2006: 97–101) observes that this particle has an exclusive function comparable to English *only*, as he (2006: 97) shows by means of the following example:

(366) *ve kavitaa hii likhate hAI.*
 they poetry hii write:IPFV.M.PL be:AUX.PRS.PL

‘They **only** write POETRY.’

This use of *hii* is comparable to the exclusive use of *íd* in ex. (339). A different example of *hii* that Varma (2006: 91) gives is the following one:

(367) *sTeshan par sonuu ne hii paapaa ko pahacaanaa.*
 station on sonu ERG hii dad ACC recognize:PFV.M.SG

‘At the station **it was** SONU **who** recognized Dad.’

This sentence is similar to the Vedic ex. (365) above. Varma (2006: 91) explains that this use of the particle evokes alternatives to the expression with which it is associated and it presupposes that, in the case of ex. (367), someone recognized Dad at the station. Moreover, he explains that this particle expresses exclusion of alternatives. This description appears to be similar to the function of exclusive particles, but it is in fact different. Varma (2006: 97–101) uses the work by Umbach (2004: 164–166) to distinguish the two functions of *hii*. Based on this analysis, I assume that Vedic *íd* in ex. (365), like Hindi *hii* in ex. (367), expresses what I label as exhaustive focus.³⁸⁵ This means that *hii* and *íd* in ex. (365) and (367), respectively, do not exclude additional individuals. Rather, in each example the particle “excludes the possibility that someone instead of the focused item makes the proposition true” (Umbach 2004: 166). Note that even though I acknowledge that this use of *íd* signals a contrast between elements, I follow Krifka (2008: 258f.) and reserve the term CONTRASTIVE FOCUS for such typical uses as correction. The difference between the two functions may be illustrated by the following passage dedicated to the horse Dadhikrā(van):

(368) *dadhikrāvṇa id u nú carkirāma / víśvā*
 Dadhikrāvan:GEN.SG.M PRT PRT now mention:SBJV.1PL all:NOM.PL.F
ín mām uśasaḥ sūdayantu / apām
 PRT 1SG.ACC Dawn:NOM.PL.F sweeten:IMP.3PL water:GEN.PL.F

³⁸⁴ ‘Indra, der Vortänzer, ist uns ein Geber großer Belohnungen’.

³⁸⁵ Notice that I defined my use of the term EXHAUSTIVE FOCUS in Section 2 based on Umbach (2004: 164–166). Unlike me, Varma (2006) refers to the type of focus that *hii* expresses in ex. (367) as “contrast I[nformation] F[ocus]”.

<i>agnér</i>	<i>uṣásah</i>	<i>sūriyasya</i>	/	<i>bṛhaspáter</i>
Agni:GEN.SG.M	Dawn:GEN.SG.F	Sun:GEN.SG.M		Bṛhaspati:GEN.SG.M
<i>āṅgirasásya</i>	<i>jiṣṇóh</i>			
Āṅgirasa:GEN.SG.M	victorious:GEN.SG.M			

‘**Just** to Dadhikrāvan will we now pay tribute—let all the Dawns sweeten me—and to the Waters, Agni, Dawn, and the Sun, also to Bṛhaspati Āṅgirasa, the victorious.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 622)

‘**It is** Dadhikrāvan **to whom** we will now pay tribute ...’ (my adaptation) RV 4.40.1

If one regards only pāda a, *íd* might be interpreted as an exclusive particle ‘only, just’. This seems to be the case in the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 622). However, Klein (2019: 44) explains that “while the function of *íd* is surely meant to accord the horse primacy of reference, this does not extend to this particle’s usual sense of exclusivity (‘only, just’), because the stanza continues in its second [hemistich] to eulogize the waters, Agni, Uṣās, Sūrya, Bṛhaspati, and Āṅgiras as well”. This example is therefore comparable to the English exx. (13) and (14) in Section 2. One way to justify an exclusive reading of *íd* would be to assume that the focus of *íd* comprises all coordinated genitives rather than only the one that precedes *íd*, i.e. ‘we will pay tribute only to Dadhikrāvan, Waters, Agni, Dawn, and the Sun, and Bṛhaspati Āṅgirasa, the victorious’. However, due to the fact that an entire clause occurs between *dadhikrāvṇas* and the other genitives, this is implausible. Jamison (comm.IV: ad loc.) correctly observes that the second hemistich is to be regarded as an afterthought.³⁸⁶ Another case in point is the following example:

(369) <i>devānām</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>ávo</i>	<i>mahát</i>	/	<i>tád</i>
god:GEN.PL.M	PRT	help:ACC.SG.N	great:ACC.SG.N		DEM:ACC.SG.N
<i>ā́</i>	<i>vṛṇīmahe</i>	<i>vayám</i>	/	<i>vṛṣṇām</i>	<i>asmábhyam</i>
LP	choose:MID.1PL	1PL.NOM		bull:GEN.PL.M	1PL.DAT
<i>ūtáye</i>					
help:DAT.SG.F					

‘We would choose the great help of the gods, of the bulls, to aid us.’ RV 8.83.1

This is the first stanza of a hymn addressed to all gods. The particle *íd* is used here to make clear who this hymn is addressed to, namely the gods and not to someone else (e.g. Soma or plants). Yet, this does not mean that the poet never wants to be helped by other beings, which would be the case if one translated *íd* as an exclusive particle: ‘We would choose only the great help of the gods’. Instead, *íd* expresses that it is the gods whose help he asks for at the moment in contrast to the help of other beings. With respect to Hindi *hii*, Varma (2006: 91) explains that

³⁸⁶ Notice furthermore that *íd* is followed by the particle *u*, which Klein assigns the function of “identity focus”, emphasizing the identity of Dadhikrāvan and the addressee of the previous hymn.

in order to express the function it has in ex. (367), the open proposition, the focus and the alternatives of the focus must be discourse-old or hearer-old. In exx. (368) and (369), this is also the case for *íd*. Both examples constitute the first *pādas* of their hymn, but in the context where they are recited it is usual that deities or other beings are payed tribute or asked for help. Moreover, both the focus and its alternatives, which are mostly other mythological characters, are known. Thus, Varma (2006: 92) shows that *hii* may also occur in newspaper headlines where there is no preceding discourse but where the relevant information can be expected to be within the reader’s common knowledge. In ex. (368), Klein (2019: 44) also sees a connection with the previous hymn, which is also dedicated to Dadhikrā, due to the presence of the particle *u*.

As I have outlined in Section 2, De Cesare & Garassino (2015) regard the fact that cleft-sentences can be combined with exclusive particles without being redundant as evidence that their semantics differs from exclusive particles. The following passage appears to be a comparable case with *íd* marking exhaustive focus:

(370) <i>índra</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>somapá</i>	<i>éka</i>
Indra:NOM.SG.M	PRT	soma.drinker:NOM.SG.M	one:NOM.SG.M

‘It’s Indra alone **who** drinks the soma.’³⁸⁷ RV 8.2.4a

In this passage, the fact that nobody else apart from Indra drinks the soma is expressed by the numeral *ékas* ‘one, alone’. Nonetheless, *índras* is in the focus of the particle *íd*.

Exx. (364)–(370) raise the question as to what the status of the exhaustiveness is that is conveyed by *íd*. In Section 2, I explained that with De Cesare & Garassino (2015) I consider exhaustiveness to be entailed by clauses that contain exclusive particles but to be conversationally implicated in cases of exhaustive focus. In cases like ex. (368) it is fairly clear that *íd* does not entail exhaustiveness. As a result, one should consider the possibility that also in passages like exx. (339) and (340), which I analyzed as clear cases of exclusive *íd*, the exhaustiveness, i.e. the exclusion of additional alternatives, is merely implicated. In this case, *íd* would not be a genuine exclusive particle. Especially due to the fact that no speakers of Vedic are alive that might comment on the acceptability of certain examples, this question is extremely difficult to answer. Nonetheless, I maintain my analysis that *íd* can function as a genuine exclusive particle. Kiss (1998: 265) explains that in Hungarian, the exclusive particle *csak* has a scalar reading, in contrast to cases involving only identificational (i.e. exhaustive) focus. Similarly, with respect to Hindi, Varma (2006: 99) finds that “the presence of scalar potential as part of the meaning of the exclusive focus particle *hii*, but not of contrast IF [= my exhaustive

³⁸⁷ The translation deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1026).

focus] *hii*, distinguishes between these two uses”. As Vedic *íd* occurs in contexts that clearly suggest a scalar reading, I conclude that it can function as an exclusive particle.

As is the case for exclusive *íd*, the exhaustive focus may comprise more than one word. In the following example it comprises the entire clause:

(371) <i>ná</i>	<i>vā</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>etán</i>	<i>mriyase</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>riṣyasi</i>	/
NEG	PRT	PRT	DEM:ACC.SG.N	die:2SG	NEG	be.hurt:2SG	
<i>devām̃</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>eṣi</i>	<i>pathíbhīḥ</i>	<i>sugébhīḥ</i>			
god:ACC.PL.M	PRT	go:2SG	path:INS.PL.M	easily.passed:INS.PL.M			

‘Truly in this way you do not die nor are you harmed: you go to the gods by paths easy to travel.’ RV 1.162.21ab

In this passage, the poet tells the sacrificial horse that it will go to the gods on easy paths instead of dying or being harmed (cf. Jamison & Brereton 2014: 344). Notice that this context is very similar to the one in ex. (357) above, where I argue that the focus of exclusive *íd* comprises the whole clause. Here in ex. (371) as well, one might render *íd* as an adversative conjunction. In fact, it is possible to interpret *íd* in ex. (357) as marking exhaustive focus as well, but I have opted for an exclusive interpretation because of the scalar component that the following pāda suggests for *íd*. Such a component is absent in ex. (371).

Thus far, I have shown in which contexts *íd* may occur and which function it fulfills there. The next example shows how subtle the difference between the presence and absence of *íd* can be. The following stanza contains eight instances of the name Indra, only two of which are followed by *íd*:

(372) <i>índro</i>	<i>divá</i>	<i>índra</i>		
Indra:NOM.SG.M	heaven:GEN.SG.M	Indra:NOM.SG.M		
<i>ī́se</i>	<i>pr̥thivyā́</i>	/	<i>índro</i>	
be.master:PERF.MID.3SG	earth:GEN.SG.F		Indra:NOM.SG.M	
<i>apām̃</i>	<i>índra</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>párvatānām̃</i>	/
water:GEN.PL.F	Indra:NOM.SG.M	PRT	mountain:GEN.PL.M	
<i>índro</i>	<i>vṛdhām̃</i>	<i>índra</i>	<i>ín</i>	
Indra:NOM.SG.M	strong:GEN.PL.M	Indra:NOM.SG.M	PRT	
<i>médhirāṇām̃</i> /	<i>índraḥ</i>	<i>kṣéme</i>	<i>yóge</i>	
wise:GEN.PL.M	Indra:NOM.SG.M	peace:LOC.SG.M	war:LOC.SG.M	
<i>háviya</i>	<i>índraḥ</i>			
to.be.called.NOM.SG.M	Indra:NOM.SG.M			

‘Indra is master of heaven and Indra of earth, Indra of the waters and Indra of the mountains, Indra of the strong and Indra of the wise; Indra is to be called upon in peace and Indra in war.’ RV 10.89.10

Pādas a–c consist of six clauses that consist of a subject and a genitive object. The predicate is only mentioned in the second clause and has to be supplied in the other ones. The two clauses

in pāda d have a different predicate. In all clauses the subject is *índras*. In the fourth and the sixth clause, *índras* is followed by *íd*. I assume that *íd* marks exhaustive focus here so that the two clauses may be translated as ‘it is Indra who is the master of the mountains’ and ‘it is Indra who is the master of the wise’, which conversationally implicates that Indra is the master and nobody else is. However, the clauses without *íd* implicate that Indra alone is the master too, which means that the difference between the two variants is very subtle. This allowed the poets to insert *íd* for reasons that are primarily stylistic or for metrical reasons. Thus, I mentioned in the literature review in the beginning of Section 5 that several scholars assume that *íd* is used to avoid hiatus. Moreover, Elizarenkova (1995: 133f.) considers the phonological shape of particles as one factor for their employment. She observes that *íd* as well as the local particles *ní* and *prá* occur in hymns dedicated to Indra due to their phonetic similarity with the name *índra-*. I agree that the Rigvedic poets had a certain freedom regarding the employment of *íd* and factors like those just mentioned probably played an important role. Nevertheless, I want to stress here, and I will do so at later points in my study as well, that by no means does this mean that *íd* is basically functionless and is employed for stylistic or metrical reasons alone. Rather, this freedom of use is made possible by the fact that the functions of *íd* are often subtle.

In this section, I have examined the function of *íd* as an exclusive particle and the closely related function of marking exhaustive focus. At this point, it is necessary to consider a claim made by Lühr (2009: 182). She contends that in the second position of a clause, unstressed particles may function as focus particles whereas stressed particles indicate that what is being uttered is shared knowledge of the speaker and the hearer. Hence, *íd* would have to be analyzed as a discourse particle. In Lühr (2010: 141f.), she assigns this function to *íd* too, but there she does call it a focus particle. Lühr (2017: 286, 2018b: 183f.) analyzes *íd* as a stressed focus particle too and distinguishes it from backgrounding particles like *hí* or *vaí*. Koziánka (2000: 225) regards *íd* primarily as a discourse particle. At any rate, the examples that I have given in this section clearly show that *íd* can function as an exclusive focus particle, just like the unstressed *cid* can function as an additive focus particle. In Section 4.8, I even showed that several functions are shared by *cid* and *íd*. As a result, I disagree with the claim that the accentuation alone is indicative of the function of a particle. However, this does not mean that I reject the possibility that *íd* may have functions other than being a focus particle. For in Sections 5.7–5.10, I find other functions as well.

This concludes the first section in my analysis of the particle *íd*. I have shown that it functions as a non-scalar (ex. (339)) and a scalar (ex. (340)) exclusive particle. In the scalar use, it is usually the alternatives higher than the focus which are excluded but there are certain

contexts in which the scale can be reversed (ex. (344)). Regarding its focus, I have shown that exclusive *íd* can occur with nominals (exx. (348)–(350)), pronominals (exx. (351)–(353)) and adverbs (ex. (354)) as well as with different syntactic functions. In addition to the numerous examples with positive polarity that I have given, it can also occur in negative polarity (ex. (355)). Furthermore, I have observed that the focus can be mentioned previously in the discourse (ex. (359)) but this need not be the case (ex. (360)). Similarly, the alternatives of the focus can be mentioned before (ex. (361)) or after (ex. (362)) but need not be mentioned explicitly at all (exx. (359), (360)). Contrary to the claim by several authors, I have argued that the focus of *íd* may comprise more than one word and even the whole clause. (exx. (353), (356), (357)). After discussing *íd* as an exclusive focus particle, I also argued that it is employed to mark exhaustive focus (exx. (365), (368), (369)). In this function it is also employed to mark contrast between two or more overt elements (ex. (364)).

5.2 *íd* as an identifier

In Section 5.1, I adduced Hindi *hii* as a parallel for the exclusive and closely related function of marking exhaustive focus that Vedic *íd* exhibits. Varma (2006: 104f.) finds another related function that *hii* has, namely to express what König (1991: 125–131) calls EMPHATIC ASSERTION OF IDENTITY. König assigns this function to elements like *exactly* and *precisely* in English and *ausgerechnet*, *eben*, *genau* and *gerade* in German. He (1991: 127f.) gives, among others, the following German example for their use:

(373) *Damit hat man Mißtrauen gerade zu einer Zeit erzeugt, wo wir so etwas am wenigsten brauchen können.*

‘This has created distrust at **just** the time we need it least.’

König (1991: 127) explains that these elements “are primarily used emphatically to assert the identity of one argument in a proposition with an argument in a different, contextually given proposition”. I follow Ricca (2017) in referring to elements that fulfill this function as IDENTIFIERS. One example with which Varma (2006: 104f.) illustrates this use of *hii* is the following:

(374) *ek din yahii sharaab aapako pii jaaegii.*
 one day this+**hii** alcohol:F you:ACC drink LV:FUT.F

‘One day this **very same** DRINK will destroy you.’ (Government poster)

Hindi *hii* is not the only exclusive particle to exhibit this function as well. The literature review in the beginning of Section 5 shows that Rigvedic *íd* has been compared to the particle *eva* in younger Sanskrit and it has even been claimed that *eva* has replaced *íd* in younger texts. I do

not intend to make any claims about the diachronic relationship of the two particles, but here as well as in the following subsections I will use *eva* as a typological parallel to determine the function of *íd*, just as I used *api* as a parallel to *cid* in Section 4. Gillon (1999: 119) observes those two function for *eva* in Classical Sanskrit as well. Also English *just* and Old Italian *pur(e)* can be used as an exclusive focus particle and as an identifier (König 1986: 60–63; Ricca: 57–60). If such a function is to be identified for *íd*, it will most probably be in contexts where the same referent is mentioned in two subsequent sentences. And indeed, such contexts are found. Consider the following passage:

(375) <i>ayám</i> DEM:NOM.SG.M	<i>bhárāya</i> taking:DAT.SG.M	<i>sānasír</i> bringing.gain:NOM.SG.M	/	<i>indrāya</i> Indra:DAT.SG.M
<i>pavate</i> purify:MID.3SG	<i>sutáḥ</i> press:PPP.NOM.SG.M	/	<i>sómo</i> soma:NOM.SG.M	
<i>jaítrasya</i> victorious:GEN.SG.M	<i>cetati</i> perceive:3SG	<i>yáthā</i> like	<i>vidé</i> know:PERF.MID3SG	//
<i>asyéd [= asya íd]</i> DEM:GEN.SG.M+PRT	<i>índro</i> Indra:NOM.SG.M	<i>mádeṣu</i> exhilaration:LOC.PL.M	<i>á</i> LP	/
<i>grābhám</i> handful:ACC.SG.M	<i>grbhñīta</i> grab:INJ.MID.3SG	<i>sānasím</i> bringing.gain:ACC.SG.M		

‘2. This one here, bringing gain for the taking, purifies himself for Indra when pressed. Soma takes note of the victorious one, as is (well) known.

3. Indra, in the raptures of **just** this (soma), grabbed a handful bringing gain’ RV 9.106.2–3b

Stanza 2 portrays soma as the helper of Indra. Stanza 3 then depicts Indra as successful and attributes this success to the help of soma. The latter is referred to by the demonstrative *asya*, which is followed by the particle *íd*. In my opinion, the most plausible assumption is that the particle is used here to emphasize the identity of the referents of *asya* and *sómas*. Thereby, it highlights again the positive properties that were attributed to soma in stanza 2. The following passage also illustrates this function of *íd*. Here, the particle follows the adverb *evá*:³⁸⁸

(376) <i>púrve</i> eastern:LOC.SG.M	<i>árdhe</i> half:LOC.SG.M	<i>rájaso</i> dim.space:GEN.SG.N		
<i>aptiyásya</i> without.flying:GEN.SG.N	/	<i>gávām</i> cow:GEN.PL.F	<i>jánitrī</i> begetter:NOM.SG.F	
<i>akṛta</i> do:AOR.MID.3SG	<i>prá</i> LP	<i>ketúm</i> beacon:ACC.SG.M	/	<i>ví u prathate</i> LP PRT spread:MID.3SG
<i>vitarám</i> further:ACC.SG.N	<i>várīya</i> further:ACC.SG.N	/	<i>óbhá</i> LP+both:ACC.DU.M	

³⁸⁸ In this passage, *evá* is used as an adverb meaning ‘so’ and not as a focus particle.

<i>prṇántī</i> fill:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.F	<i>pitarór</i> father:GEN.DU.M	<i>upástḥā</i> lap:ACC.DU.M	//
<i>evéd [= evá íd] eṣā</i> SO+PRT DEM:NOM.SG.F	<i>purutámā</i> much:SUP.NOM.SG.F	<i>dṛsé</i> see:INF.DAT.SG	<i>kām</i> PRT

‘5. In the eastern half of the dusky realm that cannot be flown to, the begetter of cows has put forth her beacon. She spreads out further, more widely, filling both laps of her two parents [=Heaven and Earth].

6. **Just** thus is she, the latest of many, to be seen.’ RV 1.124.5–6a

Stanza 5 describes the appearance of dawn. This description is then recapitulated in pāda 6a. Unlike the demonstrative *asya* in ex. (375) the adverb *evá* ‘so’ does not refer to a single individual but to the entire stanza 5. The particle *íd* expresses that the way in which dawn is to be seen is exactly as it is described in this stanza. In exx. (375) and (376) *íd* appears after anaphoric expressions. The next example shows that *íd* can also express emphatic assertion of identity when it follows cataphoric pronouns, as in the following passage:

(377) <i>tád</i> DEM:NOM.SG.N	<i>ín</i> PRT	<i>nú</i> now	<i>te</i> 2SG.GEN	<i>káraṇam</i> deed:NOM.SG.N
<i>dasma</i> wondrous:VOC.SG.M	<i>vipra</i> poet:VOC.SG.M	/	<i>áhiṃ</i> serpent:ACC.SG.M	<i>yád</i> REL:ACC.SG.N
<i>ghnánn</i> hit:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.M	<i>ójo</i> strength:ACC.SG.N		<i>átrámimīthāḥ</i> there+measure:IPRF.MID.2SG	

‘**Just** this now is your deed, wondrous poet: that smashing the serpent, you measured out your strength there.’ RV 5.31.7ab

For the particle *eva* in Classical Sanskrit, Gillon (1999: 119) states that the function of emphasizing the identity is found primarily with pronouns. The same observation is made by Varma (2006: 104f.) for Hindi *hii*. In the Vedic examples I have shown, *íd* occurs after proforms as well. Note furthermore the observation by Benfey (1852–1854: II, 48) that *íd* frequently occurs with pronouns. Moreover, Lühr (2010: 142) assumes that *íd* is used with personal pronouns to further emphasize that the referent is given. However, in the following passage the referent of the pronoun after which *íd* occurs is not mentioned before in the hymn but it needs to be inferred from the context:

(378) <i>áyāmi</i> hold:AOR.PASS.3SG	<i>ghóṣa</i> cry:NOM.SG.M	<i>indra</i> Indra:VOC.SG.M	
<i>devājāmir</i> kinsman.of.gods:NOM.SG.M	/	<i>irajyánta</i> put.in.order:INT.INJ.MID.3PL	<i>yác</i> <i>churúdho</i> when rich.spoil:NOM.PL.M
<i>vívāci</i> contest:LOC.SG.F	/	<i>nahí</i> not.for	<i>svám</i> own:NOM.SG.N
<i>cikité</i> perceive:PERF.MID.3SG		<i>jāneṣu</i> person:LOC.PL.M	/ <i>tāníd [= tāni íd]</i> DEM:ACC.PL.N+PRT

<i>ámhāṃsi</i>	<i>áti</i>	<i>parṣi</i>	<i>asmān</i>
strait:ACC.PL.N	LP	bring.over:AOR.IMP.2SG	1PL.ACC

‘The cry that is the gods’ kinsman has been offered, Indra, as the rich spoils were put in order at the verbal contest. Because (the length of) their own lifetime is not perceptible to people, carry us across **just** these straits.’ RV 7.23.2

In the second hemistich, the poet states that people do not know how long their life will be and asks Indra to help him and his associates to overcome the dangers that may prohibit a long life (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 911). However, *tāni ámhāṃsi* ‘these straits’ have not been mentioned previously in the hymn so that the hearer has to infer from the context that the poet refers here to the dangers that threaten a long life. Hence, in the terminology of Lambrecht (1994) the referent of the nominal expression is not given but “inferentially accessible”.

Just as the referent of the expression with which *íd* is associated need not be given, the following example suggests that this function of Rigvedic *íd* is not restricted to proforms either. Here, it is found after an entity-denoting nominal:

(379) <i>ámartyaṃ</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dāsám</i>	<i>mányamānam</i>	/
immortal:ACC.SG.M	PRT	Dāsa:ACC.SG.M	think:PTCP.PRS.MID.ACC.SG.M	
<i>ávābhīnad</i>	<i>ukthair</i>	<i>vāvṛdhānáḥ</i>		//
LP.cleft:IPRF.2SG	hymn:INS.PL.N	grow.strong:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M		
<i>ukthéṣu</i>	<i>ín</i>	<i>nú</i>	<i>śūra</i>	<i>yéṣu</i>
hymn:LOC.PL.N	PRT	now	hero:VOC.SG.M	REL:LOC.PL.N
<i>cākán</i>				
delight:PERF.INJ.2SG				

‘You cut down the Dāsa [=Vṛtra], even though he thought he was immortal, when you became strong through the hymns.

3. (Delight) now in **just** these hymns in which you delight, o champion’ RV 2.11.2c–3a

In this passage, *íd* possibly emphasizes the identity of *ukthéṣu* and *ukthair*. However, the syntactic interpretation of stanza 3 is exceedingly difficult and Jamison (comm.II: ad loc.) revises the translation given in the example. In the following example from a hymn to the Maruts, *íd* occurs with a figura etymologica:

(380) <i>ártham</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>vá</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>arthína</i>
task:ACC.SG.N	PRT	PRT	PRT	with.task:NOM.PL.M

‘Those with tasks (pursue) each his own task.’ RV 1.105.2a

This clause exhibits the subject *arthínas* ‘having a task’, which is derived from the thematic nominal *ártha-* ‘task’. This latter nominal constitutes the object of a covert predicate of the clause. Although *íd* occurs in a particle chain with *vái* and *u*, which makes its function even more difficult to determine, I assume that it is used to emphasize that the task which the referents of the subjects have is identical with the one they pursue (on *vái u* see Klein 1978b: 154–159).

Moreover, I assume that this function is also visible in the following example from a hymn to the Maruts, where *íd* occurs after the intensifier *svá-* ‘own’:³⁸⁹

(381) <i>bhárteva</i>	<i>gárbham</i>	<i>suvám</i>	<i>íc</i>
husband:NOM.SG.M+like	embryo:ACC.SG.M	own:ACC.SG.N	PRT
<i>chávo</i>	<i>dhuḥ</i>		
strength:ACC.SG.N	put:AOR.INJ.3PL		

‘Like a husband an embryo, they have implanted their own strength (in the earth).’ RV 5.58.7b

I believe that the identifying function of *íd* is used to reinforce the function of the intensifier and thus to further stress that the strength belongs to the Maruts and nobody else.

When particles are employed as identifiers, the effect they have may exceed the mere assertion of identity that is observable in the previous examples. König (1986: 60–62) observes that the German particles *gerade* and *eben*, as well as their English near equivalents *exactly*, *precisely*, *just* and *very* often imply “dissonance of conflict” when they are used to express emphatic assertion of identity. As an example, he gives the following English sentence:

(382) *Labour has suffered a serious, and possibly fatal haemorrhage of support among the very people on whom it most depends...*

Particularly for German *gerade* and *eben*, he (1986: 60) further explains that “[t]he two propositions over which these two particles operate are generally not compatible, i.e. they would normally not go together”. The examples that I have shown thus far do not exhibit such a conflict. Consider for instance ex. (375), where the opposite of what König observes for the English and German particles is the case. In stanza 2, *soma* is described as a helper of *Indra* and stanza 3 conveys that *Indra* is successful with the help of *soma*. However, the following example shows that *íd* is also employed when there is a dissonance between the propositions:

(383) <i>sáptī</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>ghā</i>	<i>madacyútā</i>	/
horse:NOM.DU.M	PRT	PRT	roused.to.exuberance:NOM.DU.M	
<i>mithuná</i>	<i>vahato</i>	<i>rátham</i>	/	<i>evéd [= evá íd]</i>
pair:NOM.DU.M	pull:3DU	chariot:ACC.SG.M		SO+PRT
<i>dhūr</i>	<i>vṛṣṇa</i>	<i>úttarā</i>		
chariot.poll:NOM.SG.F	bull:GEN.SG.M	higher:NOM.SG.F		

“‘It’s the twin span, the complementary pair [/married couple], aroused to exuberance, that draws the chariot [=sacrifice]; but **even** so the chariot-pole of the bull [=husband] is higher.’”³⁹⁰ RV 8.33.18

In Section 4.8, I have already discussed the function of *cid* in pāda a, which I consider to mark exhaustive focus. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1098) consider *Indra* to be the speaker of this

³⁸⁹ On the functions of *svá-* as an intensifier see Orqueda (2017). On *íd* as an intensifier see Section 5.5.

³⁹⁰ The translation of pāda a deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1098).

stanza. In the previous stanza, he said that women cannot be taught and that their will is fickle. In the first hemistich of stanza 18, he says that the chariot is drawn by a pair (instead of the bull alone), which raises the expectation that both draft animals are equal (cf. Jamison comm.VIII.1: ad loc.). In pāda c, the adverb *evá* refers to the entire first hemistich, but according to the rest of the pāda the expectation raised there is not met because one of the animals, which is identified with the wife, is smaller. Hence there is a conflict between the situation described in pādas a/b, which in pāda c is referred to by *evá*, ‘so’ and pāda c. This creates a concessive nuance, which leads to the translation ‘even so’ by Jamison & Brereton (2014). Cf. also the observation by Grassmann (1873: 205f.) that *íd* indicates that what is said about the word it emphasizes is true although it is unexpected. A related case is possibly also the following example:

(384) <i>vidé</i>	<i>hí</i>	<i>mātá</i>	<i>mahó</i>
know:PERF.MID.3SG	for	mother:NOM.SG.F	great:GEN.SG.M
<i>mahí</i>	<i>śá</i>	/	<i>sá</i>
great:NOM.SG.F	DEM:NOM.SG.F		DEM:NOM.SG.F
			<i>ít</i>
			PRT
<i>pr̥śniḥ</i>	<i>subhúve</i>	<i>gárbham</i>	
Pr̥śni:NOM.SG.F	good.offspring:DAT.SG.M	embryo:ACC.SG.M	
<i>ád dhāt</i>			
LP.put:AOR.3SG			

‘for she is known as the great mother of the great—**just** she, Pr̥śni, implanted the embryo for good offspring.’ RV 6.66.3cd

Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 410), Jamison & Brereton (2014: 864f.) and Jamison (comm.VI.2: ad loc.) observe that the predicate of pāda d usually takes male subjects, but here the subject is Pr̥śni (cf. Renou 1955–1969: X, 98f.). Jamison (comm.VI.2: ad loc.) explains that this paradox is highlighted by *sá íd* ‘just she’, which is in accordance with König’s observations on identifiers. The entity in pāda c to which *sá* refers is female so that there is a conflict with the fact that this female referent is the agent in the event described in pāda d. However, this example constitutes a special case because a conflict is present not only between propositions but also within the proposition in pāda d. For here, a clearly feminine demonstrative, with a feminine personal name as an apposition, is the subject of a verb which usually occurs with male subjects.³⁹¹

According to König (1991: 134f.), the conflict between propositions that is conveyed by identifiers can be characterized as a conversational implicature. Furthermore, he observes that there are identifiers, like German *gerade*, for which this implicature has become conventional.

³⁹¹ Geldner (1951–1957: II, 168) assumes a clause boundary within pāda d and considers Rudra to be the (null) subject of the final clause: ‘Sie ist die Pr̥śni; der Kräftigen hat er den Keim gepflanzt’. Similarly also Dōyama & Gotō (2022: 130).

With respect to *íd*, I conclude that this is not the case. Passages like ex. (375) show that *íd* also occurs in contexts where no conflict is present, which clearly speaks for an analysis as a conversational implicature.

All the Vedic examples above have shown that *íd* can be used to emphasize the identity of two elements. Peculiarly, there is another particle which frequently occurs with a similar function, namely *u*. Klein (2016: 196–198) assumes that one of the key functions of this particle is to mark “identity focus”, which appears to be comparable to König’s (1991) emphatic assertion of identity. Following Boley (2004: 155), *u* may also express contrast between two elements, another similarity it shares with *íd*. The former function of *u* is observable in the following examples:

(385) *yám* *yuñjánti* *tám* *u* *á* *sthāpayanti*
REL:ACC.SG.M yoke:3PL DEM:ACC.SG.M PRT LP stand:CAUS.3PL
‘The one whom they (usually) yoke, that one do they make climb (the chariot).’ RV 10.102.10b³⁹²

(386) *tám* *u* *stuṣa* *índaraṃ* *tám*
DEM:ACC.SG.M PRT praise:MID.1SG Indra:ACC.SG.M DEM:ACC.SG.M
gṛñīṣe
sing:MID.1SG

‘That one, Indra, do I praise, that one do I sing.’ RV 2.20.4a³⁹³

In the first example, *u* follows *tám* ‘that one’, which is coreferential with the preceding relative clause. In the second example, *tám* followed by *u* is coreferential with the *tám* in the following clause. The similar functions of *íd* and *u* are observable in the following passage:

(387) *tāv* *idā* *cid* *áhānām* / *tāv*
DEM:ACC.DU.M at.this.time PRT day:GEN.PL.N DEM:ACC.DU.N
aśvínā *vādamāna* *úpa* *bruve* /
Áśvin:ACC.DU.M praise:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M LP speak:MID.1SG
tā *u* *námobhir* *īmahe* // *tāv* *íd*
DEM:ACC.DU.M PRT reverence:INS.PL.N go:MID.1PL DEM:ACC.DU.M PRT
doṣā *tā* *uśási* *śubhás*
evening:INS.SG.F DEM:ACC.DU.M dawn:LOC.SG.F beauty:GEN.SG.F
pátī / *tā* *yāman*
lord:ACC.DU.M DEM:ACC.DU.M course:LOC.SG.N
rudrāvartanī
on.path.of.Rudras:ACC.DU.M

‘13. To these two at this very time of the days, to these Áśvins do I appeal, celebrating them, and these two do we beseech with our acts of reverence—

³⁹² The translation is adopted from Klein (1978b: 13).

³⁹³ The translation is adopted from Klein (1985a: 15).

14. **Just** these two in the evening, these two lords of beauty at dawn, and these two who follow the course of the Rudras [=Maruts] on their journey.’ RV 8.22.13–14b

In stanza 13, each pāda begins with the demonstrative *tāu/tā*, and the third instance it is followed by *u* (Klein 1978b: 59f.). In stanza 14, the anaphoric pattern continues but in pāda a, the demonstrative is followed by *íd*. Another interesting fact is that *íd* and *u* frequently occur adjacent to each other. The Rigveda contains 54 instances of the sequence *íd u*.³⁹⁴ Klein (1978b: 11, 16) assumes that in this sequence, *íd* does not fulfill any function but to avoid hiatus. However, I agree with Dunkel (1997b: 166f.), who criticizes this view. It appears that in this collocation the particles function separately because *íd* may have different functions. One instance that I have already shown is ex. (368) in Section 5.1. There, I follow the argumentation by Klein (2019: 44) that *íd* is no proper exclusive particle but expresses exhaustive focus. In contrast, it probably does have exclusive function in the following passage:

(388) *dabhrām cid dhí tuvāvataḥ / krtām śṛṇvé ádhi kṣámi / jígātu indra te mánaḥ //*

<i>távéd</i> [= <i>táva</i> íd]	u	<i>tāḥ</i>		<i>sukīrtáyo</i>	/
2SG.GEN+PRT	PRT	DEM:NOM.PL.F		glorification:NOM.PL.F	
<i>ásann</i>	<i>utá</i>	<i>prásastayah</i>	/	<i>yád</i>	<i>indra</i>
be:SBJV.3PL	and	praise:NOM.PL.F		when	Indra:VOC.SG.M
<i>mṛláyāsi</i>	<i>naḥ</i>				
have.mercy:SBJV.2SG	1PL.DAT				

‘32. For even a paltry deed of one such as you is famed on earth. Let your mind go (to us?), Indra.

33. **Just** yours will be these glorifications and encomia, when, Indra, you will be merciful to us.’ RV 8.45.32f.

At this point, I am not able to identify the exact difference between *íd* expressing emphatic assertion of identity and *u* expressing what Klein (2016) calls identity focus. What can be noted, however, is that each particle has additional functions which they do not share. Thus, Klein (1978a) identifies a conjunctive function for *u*, which I do not find for *íd*. Conversely, for instance marking epistemic modality (see Sections 5.7–5.9) does not seem to be a function of *u*.

Turning to the different functions of *íd* again, it is noteworthy that its identifying function is often exceedingly difficult to distinguish from the functions described in Section 5.1, as the following example shows:

(389) <i>juhóta</i>	<i>vṛṣṇe</i>	<i>tád</i>	íd	<i>eṣá</i>
offer:IMP.2PL	bull:DAT.SG.M	DEM:ACC.SG.N	PRT	DEM:NOM.SG.M

³⁹⁴ Four further passages contain the sequence *íd vaí u*. On the particle *vaí* in combination with *íd* and *u* see Klein (1978b: 154–159).

vaṣṭi
wish:3SG

‘Offer to the bull: he wishes **just** that.’ RV 2.14.1d

(390) <i>ṛtām</i>	<i>yemāná</i>	<i>ṛtām</i>	<i>íd</i>
truth:ACC.SG.N	hold:PTCP.PERF.MID.NOM.SG.M	truth:ACC.SG.N	PRT

vanoti
win:3SG

‘(Whoever) holds fast to truth, **just** he wins truth.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 596)

‘(Whoever) holds fast to truth, he wins **just** truth.’ (my adaptation) RV 4.23.10a

In ex. (389), it is possible that *íd* emphasizes the identity of the referent of the demonstrative *tád* with the action expressed by the imperative. Alternatively, *íd* might express exhaustive focus and the second clause could then be translated as ‘This is what he wishes’. For English as well, König (1991: 129) finds that clefts and identifiers have comparable functions. A third option, which I do not prefer but nonetheless deem possible, is that *íd* is an exclusive particle. This would explicitly express that Indra wishes nothing else but that the people offer to him. Similarly, ex. (390) allows for two interpretations. On the one hand it might be that *íd* expresses that a truthful person will be rewarded by receiving the truth and nothing else, i.e. not becoming a victim of deceit (vel sim.). On the other hand, *íd* might be used to emphasize the identity of the thing that the person holds and receives. This interpretation appears to be reflected in the translation by Witzel et al. (2013: 157).³⁹⁵ I do not follow Jamison & Brereton (2014: 596), who appear to interpret *yemānás* as the focus of *íd*.

Moreover, König (1991: 126f.) points to the similarity between identifiers like German *genau* and English *exactly* and exclusive particles. He points to the analysis of *exactly* by Wierzbicka (1986: 612), which involves exclusion of both higher and lower values. In a similar way, Nekula (1996: 148) describes the function of the German emphatic particle *eben* in the following way: “Die Fokuspartikel *eben* betont, daß nur das Element (Person, Tatsache etc.), auf das sich die Äußerung bezieht, und nichts mehr, aber auch nichts weniger als das Gesagte gemeint ist”. However, König (1991: 126f.) observes for *gerade* that in examples like the following it has characteristics that are similar to those of additives or particularizers:

(391) ***Gerade*** teure Autos verlieren rasch an Wert.

‘It is **precisely** expensive cars that lose their value quickly.’

This example does not express that expensive cars are the only ones whose value decreases quickly, but it may happen to cheaper ones as well. Hence, *gerade* is in this example more similar to *especially* than to *only*. As a result, König (1991: 127) treats these elements

³⁹⁵ ‘Wenn man das Ṛta festhält, gewinnt man eben das Ṛta’.

differently than exclusive particles. Nevertheless, Varma (2006: 104f.) refers to the function of Hindi *hii* that is relevant for this section as “identity by exclusion”. A further function of *íd* that is closely related to the one discussed here is the one that I will discuss in Section 5.4. Using the term by Lasersohn (1999), I will argue that *íd* functions as a slack regulator when it occurs after quantifiers, which means that it reduces the tolerance for deviations. With numerals, *íd* can then also be paraphrased by ‘exactly’. It excludes both higher and lower values, which is in accordance with the analysis by Wierzbicka (1986: 612). Based on König (1986: 57), this use may also be analyzed as an identifier.

Another case where different analyses are applicable is when *íd* occurs with similes. In Section 5.3, I will follow Lee (1991) in assigning *íd* an intensificatory function. However, in such passages one might also follow Ricca’s (2017: 57–59) analysis of Old Italian *pur(e)* and describe *íd* as an identifier, i.e. as describing the exactness of the comparison. Alternatively, as with numerals, one might analyze *íd* as a slack regulator in this context.³⁹⁶

In this section, I have shown that *íd* can be employed as an identifier. In this function, it can be employed with anaphoric (ex. (375)) or cataphoric proforms (ex. (377)). Even though particles with this function are typically found with proforms, *íd* is not restricted to them. It may also occur with a nominal (ex. (379)) or with an intensifier. One of the effects that the employment of *íd* in this function may have is to indicate a conflict between propositions (ex. (383)). As it also occurs in contexts where no conflict is present, I conclude that this implicature is only conversational. In general, the employment of *íd* appears to be comparable to that of the particle *u* (ex. (387)) but it is yet to be determined what their exact distribution is. When the two particles occur adjacent to each other, they appear to function independently (ex. (388)). The functions of *íd* described in this section are closely related to several of those that I describe in other sections.

5.3 Specificatory and intensificatory *íd*

Sections 5.1 and 5.2 have shown that *íd* shares some functions with English *just*, which can be used as an exclusive particle and an identifier as well. Lee (1987; 1991) investigates several functions that *just* exhibits. One of these functions he labels SPECIFICATORY. Among the examples that he provides for this function are the following (Lee 1987: 388f.):

(392) *The shingles I got just after he died.*

³⁹⁶ On a potential analysis of Hindi *-hii* as a slack regulator see Bajaj (2016: 88–93).

Lee (1987: 388f.) observes that in sentences like *P just when Q*, the particle *just* can be paraphrased with *only*, as it delimits the possible time points for P to happen to the time in which Q happens. In contrast, he finds that in sentences like *P just before/after Q*, *just* has to be paraphrased as *immediately*, as it delimits the time points for P to happen to a smaller subset of the time points that the subordinate clause denotes. More precisely, it delimits them to those time points which are close to a strict temporal boundary (cf. also Lee 1991: 48). This is also the case for ex. (392). Following the explanation by Lee, the time of death is a temporal boundary. Thus, the time after the person died has a boundary that clearly marks the beginning (i.e. his death) but it has no endpoint. The presence of *just* indicates that there is an end point which is shortly after the death, or, as Lee (1987: 389) puts it, the function of *just* “is to identify or specify the marginal phase”. He finds the same function with local expressions like *just under the eyebrows*. Compare this now with the following example by (Lee 1991: 55):

(393) *The shop is just near the bank.*

Lee (1987) subsumes cases like this within the group of specificatory *just* but he later (1991: 55–59) refines this analysis and assumes that cases like ex. (393) constitute a separate group. He labels this use of *just* INTENSIFICATORY. Lee (1991: 56) explains that cases like ex. (392) and (393) are similar in that both involve concepts whose “semantic range” has one clear boundary, i.e. the time of death and physical contact with the bank, but whose other boundary is not clearly defined. Hence, regarding ex. (393) one cannot be sure at which exact point something is not near the bank anymore. Lee goes on to explain that even though in both cases *just* “identifies a sub-part of this range close to [the clear boundary, ... t]he expression *just near the bank* does not identify a situation in which the concept ‘near the bank’ is realised in a marginal phase. On the contrary, the focus here is on a particularly intense manifestation of the situation in question. The relevant truth conditions are not on the verge of inapplicability”. I assume that like English *just*, Rigvedic *íd* also has a specificatory and an intensificatory function. I will begin with discussing the latter function. The following example, which is addressed to the Aśvins, shows *íd* after an accusative that encodes the goal of a movement:

(394) <i>arvāñcā</i>		<i>vāṃ</i>	<i>sáptayo</i>	
towards.here:ACC.DU.M		2DU.ACC	horse:NOM.PL.M	
<i>adhvaraśríyo</i>	/	<i>váhantu</i>	<i>sávanéd [= sávanā íd]</i>	<i>úpa</i>
glory.of.rite:NOM.PL.M		pull:IMP.3PL	pressed.soma:ACC.PL.N+PRT	LP

‘Turning this way, let your team, the glory of the rite, convey you **just** to our somapressings.’³⁹⁷ RV 1.47.8ab

³⁹⁷ The translation deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

Similarly to ex. (393), the semantic range of the concept ‘to our soma-pressings’ has one clear boundary, i.e. physical contact with the pressings. In contrast, is not clearly defined how far away from the pressings the Aśvins have to be brought so that one can no longer say that they were conveyed to the pressings. I assume that intensificatory *íd* is employed here to express that the horses of the Aśvins are to bring them closely to the soma and not to stop at a larger distance from there. In other words, *íd* is used to limit the range of the area where the horses are to bring the Aśvins. In this passage, this may seem somewhat redundant. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 159) do not render *íd*, so that I have added ‘just’ to their translation in the example. However, this meaning nuance is captured by Grassmann (1876–1877: II, 51), who interprets *sávanā íd* as ‘quite closely to the pressings’.³⁹⁸ Perhaps *íd* is used to underline the importance that the Aśvins arrive quickly and without any detours. A further possible interpretation I do not want to exclude here is that *íd* marks exhaustive focus. It might express that the Aśvins should come to the soma pressings instead of something else.

According to Lee (1991: 56), the intensificatory use of *just* is also found with comparisons, for according to Langacker (1987: 151) “[a] scale of similarity [...] is saliently bounded at only one extreme (that of identity i.e. full coincidence with the standard of comparison)”. On the other side of the scale, there is no clear-cut boundary that defines when two entities are not similar anymore. Hence, similarity is comparable to concepts like *near the bank*. With comparisons, *just* indicates a point on the similarity scale that is close to identity. I believe that *íd* has this function too when it occurs with the simile markers *iva* and *ná* ‘like’ (cf. Geldner 1907–1909: I, 27; Renou 1952: 375). On comparisons in Sanskrit see most recently Kulikov (2021) and Biagetti (2021). Throughout the Rigveda, there are 16 instances where *íd* follows *iva* and 4 instances where it precedes *ná* ‘like’.³⁹⁹

(395) <i>bibhédā</i>	<i>girīm</i>	<i>návam</i>	<i>ín</i>	<i>ná</i>
split:PERF.3SG	mountain:ACC.SG.M	new:ACC.SG.M	PRT	like
<i>kumbhám</i>				
pot:ACC.SG.M				
‘He split the mountain, just like a new pot.’ RV 10.89.7c				
(396) <i>vará</i>	<i>ivéd[= iva íd]</i>	<i>raivatáso</i>		
wooer:NOM.PL.M	like+PRT	of.rich.descent:NOM.PL.M		
<i>híraṇyair</i>	/	<i>abhí svadhábhī</i>	<i>tanúvaḥ</i>	
golden:INS.PL.N	LP	own.power:INS.PL.F	body:ACC.PL.F	

³⁹⁸ ‘Es fahr euch her das Fest-verschönende Gespann, recht nahe zu den Tränken hier’.

³⁹⁹ In two instances of the former group (RV 8.43.3 and 10.94.13) the particle *gha* intervenes between *iva* and *íd* (see Hejib 1984: 231f.). In the latter passage, the exact syntax and/or function of *iva* appears to be unclear.

pipiśre

adorn:PERF.MID.3PL

‘**Just** like woovers coming from wealth, with golden (ornaments) they have emblazoned their bodies through their own powers.’ RV 5.60.4ab

Ex. (395) is taken from a hymn dedicated to Indra and reports an event in which he split a mountain. In order to highlight Indra’s strength, the mountain is compared to a new pot, which easily breaks. Ex. (396) from a hymn to the Maruts expresses that the emblazoning of the Maruts is exactly like the emblazoning of rich woovers, which emphasizes their splendor. As Lee (1991: 56) does for English *just*, I assume that *íd* is used in both cases to express close proximity to “full coincidence with the standard of comparison”. I therefore follow Geldner (1907–1909: I, 27) in assuming that the function of *íd* preceding comparative *ná* is identical to the one following *iva*. The following examples shows the co-occurrence of similes with and without *íd*:

(397) <i>vakṣyántīvéd</i> [= <i>vakṣyántī+iva+íd</i>]	<i>á</i>	<i>ganīganti</i>	<i>kárṇam</i>	/
speak:PTCP.FUT.ACT.NOM.SG.F+like+PRT	LP	go:INT.3SG	ear:ACC.SG.M	
<i>priyám</i>	<i>sákhāyam</i>	<i>pariṣasvajānā</i>		/
dear:ACC.SG.M	friend:ACC.SG.M	LP.emprace:PTCP.PERF.MID.NOM.SG.F		
<i>yóṣeva</i> [= <i>yóśā iva</i>]	<i>śínkte</i>	<i>vítatādhi</i>		
maiden:NOM.SG.F+like	jangle:MID.3SG	LP.stretch:PPP.NOM.S.G.F+LP		
<i>dhánvañ</i>				
bow:LOC.SG.N				

‘**Just** like (a woman) about to speak, she keeps going up to his ear, while embracing her dear partner. Like a maiden (with her anklets?), she jangles when stretched out on the bow’ RV 6.75.3abc

In pādas a/b of ex. (397), taken from a hymn dedicated to weapons, the bowstring is compared to a woman (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 876). Her ‘dear partner’ in pāda b is the arrow (Geldner 1951–1957: II, 176). The accuracy of this simile is again emphasized by the presence of *íd*. Compare this now with pāda c. Again, the bowstring is compared to a female, this time a maiden, but *íd* does not occur after the simile marker *iva*. However, I see no obvious reason why the comparison in pādas a/b should be considered to be more accurate than the one in pāda c. This indicates that, as I have shown in Section 5.1, there seems to be a certain freedom regarding the employment of *íd* when it has intensificatory function as well.

The following example is interesting because it contains a simile marked by *iva* that is part of a complex secondary predicate. However, *íd* does not occur after *iva* but after the predicative participle:

(398) <i>gavyá</i>	<i>vástreva</i> [= <i>vástrā iva</i>]	<i>vāsáyanta</i>
bovine:ACC.PL.N	garment:ACC.PL.N+like	clothe:CAUS.PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.PL.M

<i>ín</i>	<i>náro</i>	/	<i>nír</i>	<i>dhukṣan</i>	<i>vakṣáṇābhīyah</i>
PRT	man:NOM.PL.M		LP	milk:AOR.INJ.3PL	belly:ABL.PL.F

‘The superior men, garbing (it) in cows [=milk] as if in garments, will milk (it) out from the belly.’ RV 8.1.17cd

In Section 5.7, I will argue that *íd* after secondary predicates emphasizes the truth of their content and I believe that this holds also true for ex. (398). If the truth of the entire secondary predicate is emphasized, it is then also the accuracy of the simile that receives emphasis. Therefore, although the function of *íd* is different than in the previous examples, the pragmatic effect is similar to those cases in which *íd* follows the simile marker.

Interestingly, the Rigveda does not contain a text passage in which *íd* occurs after the comparative particle/modal conjunction *yáthā* ‘like’. After, *yáthā*, the exactness of the simile appears to be expressed by *cid* (see Section 4.8).

In addition to the intensificatory function, *íd* can also be specificatory. A particularly interesting case is the adverb *ád* ‘then’. In the Rigveda, *íd* appears 59 times after this adverb. According to Klein (1985a: 130), more than fifty percent of the instances of *ád* that occur in the Rigveda precede *íd*. Hettrich (1988: 221) assumes that *ád* is reinforced (“verstärkt”) by *íd*. Klein (2014: 283f.) is more specific. He assigns *íd* a “delimitative value” in this sequence and translates the collocation as ‘just then, then immediately’. Similarly, Viti (2007: 42) explains that “[w]hile *ád* [...] represents a clausal nexus, *íd* focuses on a precise moment in which the process takes place”. This appears to be in accordance with the specificatory function that Lee (1987: 388f.; 1991: 48) assigns to *just*. An example of this employment of *íd* is the following passage:

(399) <i>átrā</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>rūpám</i>	<i>uttamám</i>	<i>apaśyam</i>	/
here	2SG.GEN	form:ACC.SG.N	highest:ACC.SG.N	see:IPRF.1SG	
<i>jígīṣamāṇam</i>		<i>iṣá</i>		<i>á</i>	
win:DES.PTCP.PRS.MID.ACC.SG.N		refreshment:ACC.PL.F		LP	
<i>padé</i>	<i>góḥ</i>	/	<i>yadá</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>márto</i>
track:LOC.SG.N	cow:GEN.SG.F		when	2SG.GEN	mortal:NOM.SG.M
<i>ánu</i>	<i>bhógam</i>	<i>ánaḷ</i>	/	<i>ád</i>	<i>íd</i>
LP	benefit:ACC.SG.M	reach:AOR.3SG		then	PRT
<i>grásiṣṭha</i>	<i>óṣadhīr</i>	<i>ajīgaḥ</i>			
most.devouring:NOM.SG.M	plant:ACC.PL.F	awaken:AOR.3SG			

‘Here I saw your highest form, seeking to win refreshments in the track of the cow. When the mortal attained the benefit from you, **just** after that the foremost devourer of plants [=Agni] awakened (you?).’ RV 1.163.7

Although the interpretation of this stanza is difficult (Oldenberg 1909–1912: I, 156f., Geldner (1951–1957: I, 226), Renou 1955–1969: XVI, 88, Doniger O’Flaherty 1981: 88f., Witzel &

Gotō 2007: 732; Jamison comm.I.2: ad loc.), the translations that render *íd* are in accordance with the function described above. As can be seen in the example, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 348) render it as ‘just’. Grassmann (1876–1877: II, 455) and Witzel & Gotō (2007: 294) render it as ‘immediately’ (‘sogleich’, ‘sofort’).⁴⁰⁰ Geldner (1951–1957: I, 226), Doniger O’Flaherty (1981: 87) and Witzel & Gotō (2007: 294) (in addition to the adverb in the main clause) express the function of *íd* by translating the conjunction introducing the subclause *yadā́* as ‘as soon as’.⁴⁰¹ All these translations allow for an interpretation of *íd* as specifying the marginal phase, i.e. it expresses that what is described in the main clause happens immediately after the event described in the subclause.

Even though I consider the above analysis of *ād íd* by Klein and Viti to be correct for passages like ex. (399), the picture is more complex than this and several functions of *íd* have to be distinguished. In order to identify these different functions, a comparison of the German particles *erst* and *nur* when they occur with temporal expressions is helpful. Following König (1981: 119f.), both of the German particles express the exclusion alternatives but with respect to temporal adverbials, *nur* excludes any other alternative time points whereas *erst* excludes just the time points before the time expressed by the adverbial.⁴⁰² König illustrates this by means of the following examples:

(400) a. *Ich fahre nur am Donnerstag nach Hannover, sonst nie.*

‘I **only** go to H. on Thursday.’

b. *Ich fahre erst am Donnerstag nach Hannover, vorher nicht*

‘I shan’t be going to H. **until** Thursday.’

Interestingly, the English exclusive particle *only* can be used in both ways and according to König (1981: 119) this is not untypical typologically. The employment of *only* for excluding both all earlier and all later time points is observable in the English translation of the a. sentence of ex. (400). Its ability to exclude only all earlier time points can be seen in the following example given by Taglicht (1984: 154):⁴⁰³

(401) *They only received the telegram two hours later*

The German translation of this sentence is ‘Sie erhielten das Telegramm erst zwei Stunden später’. The comparison with English *just* and *only*, as well as German *erst* and *nur* allows for

⁴⁰⁰ ‘so oft der Sterbliche es erlangt, dass du sie genieusst, dann sogleich verschlingst du als bester Verschlinger die Pflanzen’ (Grassmann); ‘Sobald der Sterbliche zu deinem Genuß gelangt ist, dann hat der größte Verzehrter sofort die Pflanzen geweckt’ (Witzel & Gotō).

⁴⁰¹ ‘Sobald der Sterbliche in deinen Genuß gelangt ist, hat der größte Verzehrter der Pflanzen (ihn) geweckt (?)’ (Geldner); ‘As soon as a mortal gets the food that you enjoy, the great devourer of plants awakens him’ (Doniger O’Flaherty).

⁴⁰² For a detailed analysis of *erst* see König (1979).

⁴⁰³ In this example Taglicht also marks the focus and scope of *only*.

the hypothesis that *íd* after *ád* may have three different functions: specifying the marginal phase, excluding all earlier time points and excluding all other time points. Distinguishing these functions in the Rigvedic data is problematic because the contexts often allow for more than one reading. This is already indicated by the fact that I have adduced a stanza whose interpretation is unclear as the guiding example for specificatory *íd*. The following passage is also an example in such an unclear context:

(402) <i>yadāram</i>	<i>ákrann</i>	<i>ṛbhávaḥ</i>	<i>pitṛbhyām</i>	/	
when+fitting	do:AOR.3PL	Ṛbhu:NOM.PL.M	father:DAT.DU.M		
<i>páriveriṣṭī</i>	<i>veśánā</i>	<i>damsánābhiḥ</i>	/	<i>ád</i>	<i>íd</i>
attendance:INS.SG.F	industry:INS.SG.N	wondrous.skill:INS.PL.F		then	PRT
<i>devānām</i>	<i>úpa</i>	<i>sakhyaṃ</i>	<i>āyan</i>		
god:GEN.PL.M	LP	companionship:ACC.SG.N	go:IPRF.3PL		

‘When the Ṛbhuv made fit preparations for their parents by their attentiveness, industry, and wondrous skills, **right** then they came into companionship with the gods.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 611)

‘... **only** then did they win the friendship of the gods.’⁴⁰⁴ RV 4.33.2a–c

According to the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 611), *íd* can be considered to specify the marginal phase. In contrast, Geldner (1951–1957: I, 462) and Witzel et al. (2013: 173) translate it as ‘erst’ and thereby assume it to exclude all earlier time points.⁴⁰⁵ Even though examples like these are ineligible for determining the exact function of *íd*, the Rigveda does contain clearer cases. Thus, in the following passage I assume that a function corresponding to German *erst* is the preferred reading for *íd*:

(403) <i>yadéd [= yadā íd]</i>	<i>enam</i>	<i>ádadhur</i>		
when+PRT	DEM:ACC.SG.M	put:IPRF.3PL		
<i>yajñíyāso</i>	/	<i>diví</i>	<i>devāḥ</i>	
worthy.of.sacrifice:NOM.PL.M		heaven:LOC.SG.M	god:NOM.PL.M	
<i>súriyam</i>	<i>āditēyám</i>	/	<i>yadā</i>	<i>cariṣṇú</i>
Sun:ACC.SG.M	son.of.Aditi:ACC.SG.M		when	wandering:NOM.DU.M
<i>mithunāv</i>	<i>ábhūtām</i>	/	<i>ád</i>	<i>ít</i>
pair:NOM.DU.M	be:AOR.3DU		then	PRT
				<i>prāpaśyan</i>
				LP+see:IPRF.3PL
<i>bhúvanāni</i>	<i>viśvā</i>			
creature:NOM.PL.N	all:NOM.PL.N			

‘When the gods worthy of the sacrifice set him in heaven as the Sun, the son of Aditi, when the wandering pair [=Sun and Moon?] came into existence, **only** after that did all living beings see in front of (them).’ RV 10.88.11

⁴⁰⁴ The translation follows Geldner (1951–1957: I, 462): ‘Als die Ṛbhu’s den Eltern gedient hatten mit Aufwartung, Besorgung und Kunstfertigkeiten, da erst erlangten sie die Freundschaft der Götter’.

⁴⁰⁵ ‘Als die Ṛbhuv den Eltern gedient hatten mit Aufwartung, Dienstleistung, Wunderkräften, erst dann kamen sie zur Genossenschaft der Götter’ (Witzel et al.).

This example expresses that the presence of the Sun is the prerequisite for all living beings to see. As a result, I assume that *íd* excludes the time before the Sun (and his companion) were set in the sky. Accordingly, Geldner (1951–1957: III, 281) translates *íd* as ‘erst’.⁴⁰⁶ Notice that another *íd* is present after the conjunction introducing the first subordinate clause in pāda a. However, as I will outline below, this does not appear to be indicative with respect to the three possible readings.

Apart from ex. (399) above, there is further, possibly clearer, evidence that corroborates the analysis by Klein (2014) and Viti (2007) that *íd* is specificatory:

(404) <i>yád</i>	<i>indra</i>	<i>ṛtanājiye</i>	/	<i>devās</i>		
when	Indra:VOC.SG.M	battle.charge:LOC.SG.N		god:NOM.PL.M		
<i>tvā</i>	<i>dadhiré</i>	<i>puráh</i>	/	<i>ád</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>te</i>
2SG.ACC	put:PERF.MID.3PL	LP		then	PRT	2SG.GEN
<i>haryatā</i>	<i>hārī</i>	<i>vavakṣatuḥ</i>			//	<i>yadā</i>
beloved:NOM.DU.M	bay:NOM.DU.M	grow.strong:PERF.3PL				when
<i>ṛtrām</i>	<i>nadīvṛtam</i>		/	<i>śavasā</i>		
Ṛtra:ACC.SG.M	blocking.rivers:ACC.SG.M			power:INS.SG.N		
<i>vajrin</i>	<i>āvadhīḥ</i>	/	<i>ád</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>te</i>	
with.mace:VOC.SG.M	smash:AOR.2SG		then	PRT	2SG.GEN	
<i>haryatā</i>	<i>hārī</i>	<i>vavakṣatuḥ</i>			//	<i>yadā</i>
beloved:NOM.DU.M	bay:NOM.DU.M	grow.strong:PERF.3PL				when
<i>te</i>	<i>viṣṇur</i>	<i>ójasā</i>	/	<i>trīṇi</i>		
2SG.GEN	Viṣṇu:NOM.SG.M	might:INS.SG.N		three:ACC.PL.N		
<i>padā</i>	<i>vicakramé</i>	/	<i>ád</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>te</i>	
step:ACC.PL.N	LP.step:PERF.MID.3SG		then	PRT	2SG.GEN	
<i>haryatā</i>	<i>hārī</i>	<i>vavakṣatuḥ</i>				
beloved:NOM.DU.M	bay:NOM.DU.M	grow.strong:PERF.3PL				

‘25. When, o Indra, at the battle-charge the gods set you in front, **just** after that your two beloved fallow bays waxed strong.

26. When, o mace-bearer, with your vast power you smashed Ṛtra who was blocking the rivers, **just** after that your two beloved fallow bays waxed strong.

27. When Viṣṇu strode his three steps by your might, **just** after that your two beloved fallow bays waxed strong.’ RV 8.12.25–27

In these subsequent stanzas, pāda c, which begins with *ád íd*, is identical in all stanzas. In each of the stanzas, the first hemistich consists of a temporal subclause which describes a certain event. Pāda c then conveys that after this event Indra’s fallow bays waxed strong. This means that *íd* cannot exclude all other time points on which the bays may have waxed strong, because there are two others that are explicitly mentioned. Likewise, it cannot exclude all anterior time

⁴⁰⁶ ‘Als die opferwürdigen Götter ihn an den Himmel setzten, den Sūrya, der Aditi Sohn, als das wandelnde Paar erschien, da erst sahen alle Welten’. See also his commentary on the second member of the ‘wandering couple’.

points on which the bays may have waxed strong. For unless the three events happened simultaneously, two of the stanzas would then necessarily be false. Nevertheless, Geldner (1951–1957: II, 309f.) translates *íd* as ‘erst’ in all three stanzas,⁴⁰⁷ but I consider this to be incorrect and follow the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1052f.), which is given in the example. Interestingly, the opposite is the case in the stanza that follows the three stanzas in ex. (404):

(405) <i>yadā</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>haryatā</i>	<i>hārī</i>	/	
when	2SG.GEN	beloved:NOM.DU.M	bay:NOM.DU.M		
<i>vāṛdhāte</i>		<i>divé-dive</i>		/	<i>ād</i> <i>ít</i>
grow.strong:PERF.MID.3DU		day:LOC.SG.M-day:LOC.SG.M			then PRT
<i>te</i>	<i>viśvā</i>	<i>bhūvanāni</i>	<i>yemire</i>		
2SG.DAT	all:NOM.PL.N	world:NOM.PL.N	hold:PERF.MID.3PL		

‘When your two beloved fallow bays grew strong from day to day, **just** after that all these worlds held themselves in submission to you.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1053)

‘... **only** then did all beings submit to you.’⁴⁰⁸ RV 8.12.28

The subclause in the first hemistich contains the *āmreḍita* *divé-dive* ‘from day to day’, which expresses iteration. This means that the waxing of Indra’s fallow bays took place in a longer period of time, the boundaries of which are not defined. If *ād* in the pāda c refers to this subclause, it does not constitute a clear temporal boundary like it does in ex. (404), or like the moment of death does in the English ex. (392). Hence, unlike in these examples, the time period of pāda c in ex. (405) neither has a clear end nor has it a clear beginning. Due to this lack of a clear boundary, I find the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1053), given in the example, somewhat odd. Instead, I find Geldner’s (1951–1957: II, 310) translation ‘erst’ more adequate here. Whereas in some cases there are factors which favor the reading of *íd* either excluding all previous time points or specifying the marginal phase, I find no clear cases where *íd* excludes all other points in time, neither with *ād* nor with another temporal expression. Whether *íd* did not have this function in Rigvedic times or whether it is just not attested in the transmitted corpus has to remain unclear. I do, however, find this use with local expressions:

(406) <i>yác</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>śáśvatā</i>	<i>tánā</i>	/
if	PRT	for	perpetual:INS.SG.F	succession:INS.SG.F	
<i>devám-devam</i>		<i>yájāmahe</i>		/	<i>tuvé</i> <i>íd</i>
god:ACC.SG.M-god:ACC.SG.M		sacrifice:MID.1PL			2SG.LOC PRT
<i>dhūyate</i>		<i>havíḥ</i>			
pour:PASS.3SG		oblation:NOM.SG.N			

⁴⁰⁷ ‘da erst sind deine geliebten Falben groß geworden’.

⁴⁰⁸ The translation follows Geldner (1951–1957: II, 310): ‘Als deine geliebten Falben Tag für Tag größer wurden, da erst haben sich dir alle Wesen gefügt’.

‘For even when we sacrifice to god after god in unbroken succession, it is **just** in you that the oblation is poured.’ RV 1.26.6

Furthermore, I have found no formal clue which might indicate how *ād id* is to be interpreted in a specific case. One possible factor one might think of is the form of the verb. However, both in ex. (404), where *id* specifies the marginal phase and in ex. (405), where it excludes all previous time points, the finite verb is a perfect indicative. Hence, this cannot be the determining factor.

A further interesting fact regarding *ād id* is that one temporal subclause can be followed by more than one main clause beginning with this collocation. In the following passage, one subclause is followed by as many as five main clauses, all of which begin with *ād id* (cf. Klein 2013: 153; 2014: 286) Following Jamison (comm.IV: ad loc.), this “conveys the quick succession of events”:

(407) <i>sám</i>	<i>yád</i>	<i>viśo</i>		<i>ávavṛtranta</i>		<i>yudhmá</i>	/
LP	when	clan:NOMPL.F		LP.roll:AOR.MID.3PL		fighter:NOM.PL.M	
<i>ād</i>	<i>ín</i>	<i>néma</i>		<i>indrayante</i>		<i>abhíke</i>	//
then	PRT	other:NOM.PL.M		seek.Indra:MID.3PL		collision:LOC.SG.N	
<i>ād</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>dha</i>	<i>néma</i>		<i>indriyám</i>	<i>yajanta</i>	//
then	PRT	PRT	other:NOM.PL.M		of.Indra:ACC.SG.N	sacrifice:MID.3PL	
<i>ād</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>paktíḥ</i>		<i>puroḷāśam</i>			
then	PRT	cooked.oblation:NOM.SG.F		offering.cake:ACC.SG.M			
<i>riryeyāt</i>			/ <i>ād</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>sómo</i>	<i>ví</i>	<i>papṛcyād</i>
succeed:PERF.OPT.3SG			then	PRT	soma:NOM.SG.M	LP	mix:PERF.OPT.3SG
<i>ásuśvīn</i>			/ <i>ād</i>	<i>íj</i>	<i>jujoṣa</i>		<i>vṛṣabhám</i>
non.presser:ACC.PL.M			then	PRT	enjoy:PERF.3SG		bull:ACC.SG.M
<i>yájadhyai</i>							
sacrifice:INF.DAT.SG							

‘When the battling clans have rolled together, **just** then do those on the one side seek Indra at the moment of confrontation.

5. **Just** then do those on the other side perform sacrifice to his Indrian strength; **just** then would the cooked food succeed the offering cake; **just** then would soma exclude the non-pressers; and **just** then does he [=Indra] find pleasure in the bull [=soma] for the sacrifice to proceed.’ RV 4.24.4c–5

It is furthermore noteworthy that *id* can occur not only in the main clause after *ād* but also in the subordinate clause after the conjunction, as has already been the case in ex. (403) above. The following three types are attested: 1) *id* occurs in the main clause 2) *id* occurs in the subordinate clause 3) *id* occurs both in the main clause and in the subordinate clause. These patterns are visible in the following three passages:

(408) <i>cākṣmó</i>	<i>yád</i>	<i>vájam</i>	<i>bhárate</i>
penetrating:NOM.SG.M	when	prize:ACC.SG.M	carry:MID.3SG

matī *dhānā* / *ād* *ít* *sūryas*
 thought:INS.SG.F stake:ACC.PL.N then PRT sun:NOM.SG.M

tapati *tapyatúr* *vṛthā*
 blaze:3SG blazing:NOM.SG.M at.will

‘When the penetrating one bears away the prize and the stakes through his thinking, **just** then does the blazing sun blaze at will.’ RV 2.24.9cd

(409) *yadéd [= yadā́ íd]* *áyukta* *harítaḥ* *sadhásthād* /
 when+PRT yoke:AOR.MID.3SG tawny:ACC.PL.F seat:ABL.SG.N

ād *rātrī* *vāsas* *tanute*
 then Night:NOM.SG.F garment:ACC.SG.N stretch:MID.3SG

simásmāi
 entire:DAT.SG.M

‘When he has yoked his tawny horses from their seat, **just** after that Night stretches her garment for him.’ RV 1.115.4cd

(410) *yadéd [= yadā́ íd]* *ástambhīt* *pratháyann*
 when+PRT prop:AOR.3SG spread:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.M

amū́m *dívam* / *ād* *ít* *janīṣṭa*
 DEM:ACC.SG.F heaven:ACC.SG.F then PRT be.born:AOR.INJ.MID.3SG

pārthivāḥ
 earthly:NOM.SG.M

‘**just** when he propped up yonder heaven as he spread it out, **right** after that the earth dweller was born.’ RV 8.51.8cd

Unfortunately, also in these cases it is difficult to determine the exact meaning of the examples and the contribution that *íd* makes. As a result, I am uncertain whether each of these patterns corresponds to a certain function or scope of *íd* or whether these three patterns are merely stylistic variants of each other. Geldner (1907–1909: I, 28) gives as a translation for *yadā́ íd* ‘sobald als’, for *ād íd* ‘und sogar’ and ‘alsbald’ and for *yadā́ íd ... ād íd* ‘sobald (als erst) – da (alsbald)’, but this does not seem to be very helpful in determining the exact nuances of these patterns. Before concluding this section, it needs to be mentioned that there are also cases in which *íd* follows *ād* or the conjunction in the subclause but it might not have any of the functions discussed here, as in the following passage:

(411) *prátirataṃ* *jahitásyā́yu°* *dasrā* /
 LP+cross:IPRF.2DU leave:PPP.GEN.SG.M+lifetime:ACC.SG.N wondrous:VOC.DU.M

ād *ít* *pátim* *akṛṇutaṃ* *kanī́nām*
 then PRT husband:ACC.SG.M do:IPRF.2DU young:GEN.PL.F

‘You extended the lifetime of him who was left behind, wondrous ones, and thereby you made him the husband of young women.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 270)

‘and **just** after that you made him the husband of young women.’ (my adaptation) RV 1.116.10cd

As can be seen in the example, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 270) do not regard *ád* merely as temporal but translate it as ‘thereby’.⁴⁰⁹ In this case, *íd* probably does not have one of the functions discussed here. In contrast to Jamison & Brereton, Geldner (1951–1957: I, 154) regards *ád* as temporal and translates it as ‘then’ (‘dann’).⁴¹⁰ With this reading an interpretation of *íd* as specificatory is possible. More difficult are passages like the following:

(412) <i>yádíd</i> [= <i>yádi íd</i>]	<i>ahám</i>	<i>yudháye</i>	<i>samnáyāni</i>	/
when+PRT	1SG.NOM	battle:INF.DAT.SG	LP.lead:SBJV.1SG	
<i>ádevayūn</i>		<i>tanúvā</i>		
not.following.gods:ACC.PL.M		body:INS.SG.F		
<i>śúśujānān</i>	/	<i>amā</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>túmraṃ</i>
puff.up:PTCP.PERF.MID.ACC.PL.M		at.home	2SG.DAT	big:ACC.SG.M
<i>vṛṣabhám</i>	<i>pacāni</i>			
bull:ACC.SG.M	cook:SBJV.1SG			

‘When I will drive together for battle those who do not follow the gods, puffing themselves up in their bodies, at home I will cook you a bulging bull’ RV 10.27.2a–c

In this passage, *íd* appears to have none of the functions discussed in this section and I am not certain what function it does fulfill here. Geldner (1951–1957: III, 165) appears to translate it as an emphazier (‘wirklich’),⁴¹¹ but in this case I would expect it to occur after the finite verb (cf. Section 5.8).

In this section, I have discussed several functions that *íd* can have after temporal and local expressions as well as with comparisons. I have argued that like English *just* it can be intensificatory or specificatory (exx. (394), (404)). The specificatory function is possibly observable with local expressions. It seems to be more clearly attested with comparisons (ex. (395), (396)) Moreover, like German *erst* it can exclude all previous time points (ex. (403)). I have found no passage where *íd* excludes all other time points but I do find this exclusive function with local expressions (ex. (406)). Specifically with respect to the adverb *ád* ‘then’, I have shown that *íd* may occur not only in the main clause, following *ád* but instead after the conjunction of the subordinate clause, or after both (exx. (408)–(410)). I have also shown an example in which *íd* follows *ád* but the latter does not necessarily have temporal meaning (ex. (411)).

⁴⁰⁹ See also Pirart (1995: 174): ‘lui, permettant ainsi d’être le mari des jeunes filles’.

⁴¹⁰ ‘Ihr Meister verlängertet des Verlassenen Leben und dann machtet ihr ihn noch zum Gatten von Jungfrauen’.

⁴¹¹ ‘Wenn ich wirklich die mit ihrem Leibe sich breitmachenden Gottlosen zum Kampfe stellen werde, dann will ich dir daheim einen kräftigen Stier kochen’.

5.4 *íd* after quantifying expressions

In the literature, it has been observed that *íd* has a special function when it occurs after universal quantifiers (e.g. Grassmann 1873: 206) Therefore, this section deals with the function of *íd* after expressions that involve quantification. In the first part of this section, I will investigate *íd* after universally quantifying expressions and numerals. The second part of this section is dedicated to the use of *íd* after *āmreḍitas*, which depending on the context have a meaning that is comparable to universal quantifiers.

5.4.1 *íd* after universal quantifiers and numerals

In the Rigveda, the particle *íd* regularly occurs immediately after universally quantifying expressions (76 times). The most frequent of these expressions are the pronominal adjective *viśva-* ‘every, all’ (45 times) and the adverb *sádam* ‘always’ (26 times).⁴¹² Further universally quantifying expressions with which *íd* occurs are *sárva-* ‘every, all’ (4 times), and *śásvant-* ‘perpetual’ (1 time). With respect to English *always*, Beaver & Clark (2003: 325) state that “[e]vent quantificational readings [...] can be distinguished from purely temporal readings, i.e. those which state that some proposition holds continuously during some period”. For the purpose of the present study, I do not distinguish between these types and treat all instances of *sádam*, as well as *śásvant-*, alike. Examples of *íd* occurring with these universal quantifiers can be seen in the text passages below:

(413) *viśvén* [= *viśvā íd*] *náraḥ* *suapatyáni*
 every:ACC.PL.N+PRT man:NOM.PL.M with.good.descendants:ACC.PL.N
cakruḥ
 do:PERF.3PL

‘The men have done all (ritual actions) bringing good descendants.’ RV 7.91.3d

(414) *mandráṃ* *hótāraṃ* [...] / *mánurhitaṃ*
 delighting:NOM.SG.M Hotar:ACC.SG.M placed.by.Manu:ACC.SG.M
sádam íd *rāyá* *īmahe*
 always PRT wealth:ACC.PL.M beseech:INT.MID.1PL

‘The delighting Hotar, [...] the one placed by Manu, do we ever beseech for wealth.’ RV 3.2.15

(415) *tám* *tvā* *bhaga* *sárva* *íj*
 DEM:NOM.SG.M 2SG.ACC Bhaga:VOC.SG.M every:NOM.SG.M PRT

⁴¹² The number of passages in which *íd* occurs after *viśva-* includes RV 7.98.1, where *íd* occurs after the compound *viśvāhā* ‘every day’. Moreover, it contains RV 4.30.3 and 8.47.4, where the particles *caná* and *gha*, respectively, occur between *viśva-* and *íd*.

johavīti
call:INT.3SG

‘Each and every one constantly calls on you, Bhaga.’ RV 7.41.5c

(416) <i>yám</i>	<i>aśvinā</i>	<i>dadáthuḥ</i>	<i>śvetám</i>	
REL:ACC.SG.M	Aśvin:VOC.DU.M	give:PERF.2DU	white:ACC.SG.M	
<i>ásvam</i>	/	<i>aghāśuvāya</i>	<i>śásvad</i>	<i>ít</i>
horse:ACC.SG.M		with.bad.horse:DAT.SG.M	perpetual:NOM.SG.N	PRT
<i>suastí</i>	/	<i>tád</i>	<i>vām</i>	<i>dātrám</i>
fortune:NOM.SG.N		DEM:NOM.SG.N	2DU.GEN	gift:NOM.SG.N
<i>máhi</i>		<i>kīrténiam</i>	<i>bhūt</i>	
great:NOM.SG.N		praiseworthy:NOM.SG.N	be:AOR.INJ.3SG	

‘O Aśvins, the white horse that you gave to (Pedu), whose horse was bad, to be everlasting well-being (for him)—that great gift of yours is to be famed.’ RV 1.116.6a–c

The translators often leave *íd* untranslated in this position, but the function that it appears to have in examples like these is to emphasize the universal quantifier, i.e. to stress that there are no exceptions. Thus, Grassmann (1873: 206) states: “bei den Begriffen der Allheit drückt es aus, dass diese Allheit im vollen Sinne gilt”. It has to be examined, however, whether such a function of *íd* can be reconciled with its functions as an exclusive particle discussed in Section 5.1 (cf. Huijsmans 2019: 9). Monier-Williams (1899: 165) names *vísva- íd* ‘every one indeed’ and *śásva- íd* ‘constantly indeed’ as examples of *íd* “expressing excess or exclusion”, besides *éka íd* ‘only one’. At least at first sight, however, the exclusive function of *íd* does not seem to be present here. On the contrary, according to the description by Grassmann, *íd* emphasizes the fact that no entity or element is excluded when it occurs with a universal quantifier.

First of all, it has to be noted that such a behavior of a particle, i.e. having exclusive function as well as the function observable in exx. (413)–(416), has parallels both within Sanskrit and in languages that are only remotely related or even entirely unrelated. Within Sanskrit, the behavior of *íd* is paralleled by the particle *eva*, which according to the literature fulfills functions similar to those of Rigvedic *íd* in later Sanskrit. According to Gillon (1999: 119), it does not only function as an exclusive particle, but it also conveys the meaning ‘without exception’ when it occurs after universally quantifying expressions like *sarva-* ‘all’. Consider the following text passage from the Manusmṛti:

(417) <i>sarvasyaivāśya</i> [= <i>sarvasya eva asya</i>]	<i>sargasya</i>	<i>dharmato</i>
every:GEN.SG.M+PRT+DEM:GEN.SG.M	creation:GEN.SG.M	law:ABL.SG.M
<i>brāhmaṇaḥ</i>	<i>prabhuḥ</i>	
Brahmin:NOM.SG.M	mighty:NOM.SG.M	

‘the Brahmin is by Law the lord of this whole creation’ (M 1.93.2)⁴¹³

According to the meaning that Gillon assigns to the collocation *sarva- eva*, this text passage expresses that the Brahmin is the lord of this entire creation and emphasizes that there is not a single entity which is not subject to the Brahmin. Albeit genetically and geographically completely unrelated, a similar function can also be observed for the particle *ʔut* in the Central Salish language *ʔayʔajuθəm* spoken in North America. According to Huijsmans (2019: 1–3), *ʔut* is an enclitic which usually, but not always, follows the first prosodic word in the clause. (cf. Watanabe 2003: 514f.). Hence, it exhibits similar syntactic behavior to the (stressed) Vedic *íd*. Huijsmans explains that in addition to its exclusive function, *ʔut* also appears after universally quantifying expressions, like *íd* and *eva* in exx. (413)–(417). Consider the following utterances:

(418) *Context: This is repeated throughout a story where an increasing number of animals are trying to pull a big fish onto shore.*

namaʔ=ʔut tayq
little.bit=EXCL move

‘It **only** moved a little.’ (Huijsmans 2019: 1f.)⁴¹⁴

(419) *Context: You went to the store with a shopping list. The last couple times you’ve gone, you’ve forgotten eggs. When you get home, you say:*

ʔuwkʷ=ʔut tam yaχ-at-an s tʰukʷ
all=EXCL thing remember-CTR-1SG.ERG NMLZ day

‘I remembered everything today.’

Consultant’s comment: You’re really emphasizing that you got everything. (Huijsmans 2019: 2)

(420) *Context: This sentence is from a storyboard where the main character is being described as very industrious.*

paya=kʷa=ʔut xʷi•xʷipumixʷ
always=RPT=EXCL IPFV•sweep

‘He was always sweeping.’ (Huijsmans 2019: 2)

In ex. (418), *ʔut* is used as a scalar exclusive operator, comparable to the use of *íd* in ex. (340) in Section 5.1.⁴¹⁵ Huijsmans (2019: 9–11) observes that *ʔut* after universal quantifiers appears to have the effect that exceptions are less tolerable. According to her, a similar effect can also

⁴¹³ I have adopted the text and translation from Olivelle (2005: 91; 398); Olivelle writes the Sanskrit text in Devanāgarī script, but I have transliterated it for the convenience of the reader.

⁴¹⁴ In each example that I quote from Huijsmans (2019), I only give the phonemic representation and not the orthographic one.

⁴¹⁵ Huijsmans (2019: 3–8) follows the analysis of English *only* by Coppock & Beaver (2014) and assumes that *ʔut* is a scalar exclusive and that it does not occur in what they regard as non-scalar contexts.

be observed in English, namely when the exclusive particle *just* occurs with universal quantifiers, as she shows by the following examples:

(421) *Context: A kid has a long Christmas list. His dad goes out and buys everything on the list. His mother is a bit exasperated and says:*

- a. *He bought **just** everything!*
- b. *He bought everything except the train!*
- c. *#He bought **just** everything except the train!*

The utterance in b, albeit containing a universal quantifier, allows for exceptions. In contrast, the sentence in c, containing the universal quantifier preceded by *just*, is less acceptable when exceptions are conceded. Huijsmans observes the same tendency for *always*, so that an utterance like *He just always showed up on time. ??{Only/just} occasionally he'd be late if the bus didn't come* is odd, because *just always* signals a low tolerance for exceptions; it would be more acceptable without *just*.

I believe that Huijsmans is essentially correct in assuming that the presence of *but* in $\lambda y\lambda x\lambda u\theta m$ and of *just* in English with universal quantifiers reduces the acceptability of exceptions and in accordance with Grassmann (1873: 206), I assume the same function for *id*. As a result, I believe that the function of *id* in the examples that I have discussed thus far in this section can be best described as what Laserson (1999) calls a SLACK REGULATOR. Laserson (1999: 522–525) observes that many utterances are imprecise but nevertheless regarded as true, i.e. people “often speak quite loosely”. For instance, the sentence *Mary arrived at three o'clock* is generally considered to be true even if Mary only arrived at three o'clock and fifteen seconds. He calls this tolerance for negligible deviance PRAGMATIC SLACK. Such a tolerance for deviance or exceptions exists with universal quantification too. Consider the following examples given by Laserson:

(422) *The townspeople are asleep.*

(423) ***All** the townspeople are asleep.*

Laserson argues that the two sentences are truth-conditionally equivalent, because a sentence like *Although the townspeople are asleep, some of them are awake* appears contradictory. Nevertheless, ex. (422) allows for exceptions, for instance when the speaker wants to attack the town and is wondering if someone stands guard. Thus, ex. (422) “allows only as many townspeople to be awake as can be, for practical purposes, ignored”. Laserson furthermore argues that with the actual universal quantifier *all* present, the tolerable number of exceptions, i.e. the pragmatic slack, is reduced. Yet, even with *all* present, the pragmatic slack can still be further reduced, as in the following example, which Laserson (1999: 534) gives:

(424) ***Absolutely** all the townspeople are asleep.*

Lasersohn (1999) calls expressions like *exactly*, *all* and *absolutely* SLACK REGULATORS, as they reduce the pragmatic slack, i.e. the tolerance of deviance or exceptions. He (1999: 525) summarizes his observations in the following way:

When extreme precision is not required, people accept utterances that deviate in minor ways from the truth. But the degree of deviation allowed is not determined solely by the pragmatics of the situation of utterance, but in part by the appearance of particular words within the utterance itself. We might call these words SLACK REGULATORS.

In her semantic account of the different functions of English *just*, Wiegand (2018: 424f.) observes that this particle exhibits the behavior of a slack regulator when it occurs with extreme predicates as in the sentence *That fish was just gigantic!*.⁴¹⁶ Notice, however, that in this study, I do not aim to provide a formal semantic analysis of *íd* that comprises all of its functions. Huijsmans (2019: 9–13) analyzes the function of *ɔut* after universal quantifiers as DOMAIN WIDENING, and therefore compares it to English emphatic universals like *EVERYone* (Shank 2004: 122–129). Lasersohn (1999: 526f.) establishes the concept of PRAGMATIC HALOS in his framework in order to account for the tolerable deviance from the literal truth. By this he means “that the pragmatic context associates [a] denotation with a set of objects of the same logical type as the denotation itself [and the objects] differ from the denotation only in some respect that is pragmatically ignorable in context”. These sets form the pragmatic halo. Wiegand (2018: 424f.) adopts this notion for her analysis of *just*.⁴¹⁷ My aim in this study is merely to describe the functions of *íd* and to corroborate my findings by showing that exclusives in other languages exhibit similar functions. I will therefore adopt Laserson’s term SLACK REGULATOR because in my opinion it captures the functions of the particle described above. However, I do not want to commit myself to a particular semantic framework by adopting this term.

As for the particle *ɔut* in ʔayʔaʃuθəm, Huijsmans (2019: 11f.) observes a difference in meaning depending on whether it occurs after *ɔukʷ* ‘all’ or after *paya* ‘always’. Even though speakers’ comments suggest a similar emphasis expressed by *ɔut*, it appears that *paya=ɔut* allows for greater pragmatic slack. Compare the odd ex. (425) with the more acceptable ex. (426):

(425) <i>ɔuwkʷ=ɔut</i>	<i>tam</i>	<i>yaχ-at-an</i>	<i>#huy=ɔut</i>	<i>kʷ</i>	<i>χʷaχʷit</i>
all=EXCL	thing	remember-CTR-1SG.ERG	only=EXCL	DET	egg
	<i>niy-əxʷ-an</i>				
	forget-NCTR-1SG.ERG				

Intended: #‘I just remembered everything except I forgot the eggs.’ (Huijsmans 2019: 11)

(426) <i>paya=ɔut</i>	<i>ʔəm•ɔimaš</i>	<i>Dave</i>	<i>huy=ɔut</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>čə•čt=as</i>	<i>xʷa</i>
always=EXCL	PL•walk	Dave	finish=EXCL	if	IPFV•rain=3SBJV	NEG

⁴¹⁶ More precisely, Wiegand (2018: 425) assumes that *just* quantifies over a covert slack operator.

⁴¹⁷ For yet a different analysis of English *just* and *simply* with universal quantifiers see Beltrama (2018: 321f.).

čam=as *θo* *λəq*
 MOD=3SBJV go go.outside

‘Dave always walks except if it’s raining he doesn’t go out.’ (Huijsmans 2019: 11)

The Rigvedic data are insufficient to determine whether *sádam íd* exhibits the same tendency for greater pragmatic slack as *paya=λut*. At least, I have not found a context for *sádam íd* that is comparable to ex. (426). Before moving on to other types of quantifiers than the ones discussed thus far, I would like to mention that the function of *íd* as a slack regulator is also attested in negative polarity, for instance in the following example:

(427) *mā* *te* *sákhāyaḥ* *sádam* *íd*
 NEG 2SG.GEN comrade:NOM.PL.M always PRT
riṣāma
 be.harmed:INJ.AOR.1PL

‘Let us, your comrades, never be harmed.’ RV 4.12.5c

Notice, however, that here *sádam íd* semantically has wide scope over the prohibitive particle: *Let it always (without exception) be the case that we are not harmed* rather than *Let it not be the case that we are always (without exception) harmed*. The latter interpretation would mean that the speakers do not care if they are harmed sometimes.

Universally quantifying expressions are not the only quantifiers that are followed by *íd* in the Rigveda. A further group of quantifiers is numerals. Thus, *íd* follows the numeral *éka-* ‘one’ 24 times in the Rigveda. Notice that *éka-* does not only mean ‘one’ but can also express the meaning ‘alone’, as in the following example from a hymn dedicated to Indra:

(428) *tvám* *vṛtrāṇi* *haṃsy* *apratīni*
 2SG.NOM obstacle:ACC.PL.N hit:2SG irresistible:ACC.PL.N
éka *íd* / *ánuttā* *carsaṇīdhṛtā*
 one:NOM.SG.M PRT admitted:ACC.PL.N supporting.men:INS.SG.M

‘You, **all** alone, smite the unopposable obstacles that have been conceded by the one who sustains the domains [=Varuṇa?].’ RV 8.90.5cd

As the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1189) suggests, this example allows for the same analysis of *íd* as a slack regulator as in the above examples involving universal quantifiers. In light of the fact that this hymn praises Indra’s glorious deeds and powers, one can assume that also in this sentence the poet uses *íd* to stress that during the fight with his enemy, Indra is completely alone and does not need any help from anybody, i.e. there are no exceptions to the proposition uttered in this example. Accordingly, Renou (1952: 375) gives ‘all alone’ (‘tout seul’) as a translation für *éka íd* in his grammar. Nevertheless, an interpretation of *íd* as a scalar exclusive particle cannot be excluded here. One might translate pāda a as ‘You, only one (man), smite the unopposable obstacles’. According to this interpretation, the poet expresses his

astonishment about Indras powers by saying that it takes one man and no more than one man to smite these obstacles, even though one would expect that it takes many more to achieve this. The following example is of a different nature:

(429) <i>vṛthā</i>	<i>krīlanta</i>		<i>īndavaḥ</i>	/	<i>sadhāstham</i>	<i>abhī</i>
at:will	play:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.PL.M		drop:NOM.PL.M		seat:ACC.SG.N	LP
<i>ēkam</i>	<i>īd</i>	/	<i>sīndhor</i>		<i>ūrmā</i>	<i>vī</i>
one:ACC.SG.N	PRT		river:GEN.SG.M		wave:LOC.SG.M	LP
<i>akṣaran</i>						
flow:IPRF.3SG						

‘Moving playfully at will toward one **and the same** seat, the drops have flowed in various ways into the swell of the river.’ RV 9.21.3

In this example, *īd* appears to resolve the ambiguity that may occur in pādas a and b due to the quantifier *ēka*- ‘one’, for the following interpretations are possible:

α. For all the drops there is a seat to which they move (i.e. the drops move to different seats).⁴¹⁸

β. There is a seat so that all the drops move to it (i.e. the drops all move to the same seat).

I believe that the exclusive particle *īd* is used here to disambiguate the secondary predicate in pādas a and b and to signal that the meaning in β. is intended: There is only one seat so that the drops move toward it. This view is also held by Lüders (1951: 224), who assumes that *sadhāstham* ‘to the seat’ refers to the heavenly place (“himmlische Stätte”), i.e. Soma’s heavenly seat.⁴¹⁹ Renou (1955–1969: VIII, 69) follows him.

With numerals other than *ēka*, *īd* also appears to have the function of either an exclusive particle or of a slack regulator, but the exact interpretation is often elusive. One clear case is the following passage dedicated to Viṣṇu:

(430) <i>duvé</i>	<i>īd</i>	<i>asya</i>		<i>krāmaṇe</i>	<i>suvarḍśo</i>	/
two:ACC.DU.N	PRT	DEM:GEN.SG.M		stride:ACC.DU.N	sunlike:GEN.SG.M	
<i>abhikhyāya</i>	<i>mārtiyo</i>		<i>bhuranyati</i>	/	<i>ṭṛtīyam</i>	<i>asya</i>
LP.see:CVB	mortal:NOM.SG.M		stir:3SG		third:ACC.SG.N	DEM:GEN.SG.M
<i>nākir</i>	<i>ā</i>	<i>dadharṣati</i>				
nobody	LP	dare:PERF.SBJV.3SG				

‘On catching sight of **just** two strides of him of sunlike appearance, a mortal bestirs himself. His third no one will dare’ RV 1.155.5a–c

This stanza refers to the famous three strides of Viṣṇu, which will be discussed in more detail in the analysis of ex. (432). Without the particle *īd*, the meaning of pādas a/b is that a mortal

⁴¹⁸ For simplicity’s sake, I assume universal quantification for the plural *īndavas* ‘drops’ here.

⁴¹⁹ “Der Zusatz *ēkam īd* läßt doch eher an die eine Stätte im Himmel denken, zu der alle Somas gelangen, als an den Dronakalaśa, wie allgemein im Anschluß an Sāyaṇa angenommen wird”.

bestirs himself on catching sight of two of Viṣṇu’s three strides. In pāda c, the third stride is then explicitly excluded, which facilitates the assumption that *íd* is used as a scalar exclusive particle here. A further clear case is the following text passage:

(431) <i>ví</i>	<i>aśema</i>		<i>deváhitam</i>		<i>yád</i>
LP	reach:AOR.OPT.1PL		established.by.gods:NOM.SG.N		REL:NOM.SG.N
	<i>āyuh</i>	//	<i>śatám</i>	<i>ín</i>	<i>nú śarádo</i>
	lifetime:NOM.SG.N		hundred:NOM	PRT	now autumn:NOM.PL.F
	<i>ánti devā</i>	/	<i>yátrā naś</i>	<i>cakrá</i>	<i>jarásam</i>
	in.front god:VOC.PL.M		where 1PL.GEN	do:PERF.2PL	old.age:ACC.SG.M
	<i>tanúnām</i>	/	<i>putráso</i>	<i>yátra pitáro</i>	<i>bhávanti</i>
	body:GEN.PL.F		son:NOM.PL.M	where father:NOM.PL.M	become:3PL

‘might we traverse the lifetime that has been established by the gods.

9. A hundred autumns are now in front (of us), o gods, where you have made old age for our bodies, where sons become fathers.’ RV 1.89.8d–9c

In this text passage, the gods are asked to grant the mortals the appropriate lifetime (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 221) and the regular lifetime of a human was believed to be one hundred years (Geldner 1951–1957: I, 114). As a result, I regard *íd* as a slack regulator, since pāda 9a refers to the exact god-given (*deváhitam*) time of autumns (or years) that a human being is supposed to live. This is in accordance with Witzel & Gotō (2007: 157), who translate this pāda as ‘Genau hundert Jahre liegen nun vor (uns), ihr Götter’. Other examples than exx. (430) and (431) are less clear. Consider ex. (432), which contains the numeral ‘three’:

(432) <i>yá</i>	<i>idám</i>		<i>dīrghám</i>		<i>práyataṃ</i>
REL:NOM.SG.M	DEM:ACC.SG.N		long:ACC.SG.N		LP.extend:PPP.ACC.SG.N
	<i>sadhástham</i>	/	<i>éko</i>		<i>vimamé</i>
	dwelling.place:ACC.SG.N		alone:NOM.SG.M		measure:PERF.MID.3SG
	<i>tribhír</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>padébhīḥ</i>		
	three:INS.PL.N	PRT	step:INS.PL.N		

‘who alone with **just** three steps measured out this dwelling place here, long and extended’ RV 1.154.3cd

The hymn from which this example is taken describes how Viṣṇu “measured out the cosmic spaces, earth, midspace, and heaven, and provided room for the creatures to live” (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 331).⁴²⁰ Since these three spaces are enormously large, one can assume that three is an unexpectedly low number of steps that one needs to measure them out. As a result, the interpretation of *íd* as a scalar exclusive particle (‘no more than three’) is justifiable, especially due to the presence of the numeral *éka*- ‘alone’. This interpretation is in accordance with the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 331) and can also be found in that of

⁴²⁰ But cp. Doniger O’Flaherty (1981: 226f.), who wonders whether the ‘dwelling place’ refers “to the entire triple world or to the earth as opposed to the upper dwelling-place”.

Macdonell ([n.d.]: 35), who translates ‘Him who has measured out with but three footsteps, Alone, this long and far-extended station’ and in the one by Doniger O’Flaherty (1981: 226), who translates ‘who alone with but three steps measured apart this long, far-reaching dwelling-place’. However, since each of Viṣṇu’s steps corresponds to one cosmic space, I believe that it is also possible to interpret *íd* as a slack regulator by means of which the poet expresses that the exact number of steps is important. Since there are exactly three cosmic spaces, Viṣṇu made exactly three steps. In this interpretation, the poet wants to clarify that the number three is not just used representing a small number of steps (it may have been four but he is not really sure), but that the exact number of three is relevant here. It is interesting with respect to both interpretations that Viṣṇu’s three steps are a central topic of the hymn, so that both before and after the excerpt given in ex. (432) the three steps are mentioned, but each time without *íd*. Below I give the entire stanza from which ex. (432) is taken as well as the preceding and the following one. For reasons of space I do not gloss the Vedic text but underline the relevant expressions.⁴²¹

(433) *prá tád viṣṇu stavate vīriyeṇa / mrgó ná bhīmáḥ kucaró giriṣṭhāḥ / yásyorúṣu triśú
vikrámanesu /adhikṣiyánti bhúvanāni víśvā //*

*prá viṣṇave · śūśám etu mánma / girikṣíta urugāyāya vṛṣṇe / yá idám dīrghám práyataṃ
sadhástham / éko vimamé tribhír ít padébhīh //*

*yásya trí pūrṇá mádhunā padāni / ákṣīyamāṇā svadháyā mādanti / yá u tridhātu pṛthivīm
utá dyām / éko dādihāra bhúvanāni víśvā*

‘2. In this way Viṣṇu will be praised for his heroic deed—(he who is) like a fearsome wild beast, living in the mountains and roaming wherever it wants, in whose three wide strides dwell all living beings.

3. Let my fortifying thought go forth to Viṣṇu, the mountain-dwelling, wide-ranging bull, who alone with just three steps measured out this dwelling place here, long and extended,

4. Whose three steps, filled with honey, never becoming depleted, find elation through their own power, who alone supports heaven and earth in their three parts and all living beings.’ RV 1.154.2–4

The question is then why *íd* occurs only in pāda b of stanza 3 but not before or after. The reason might be that the presence or absence of *íd* does not change the truth value of the utterances. I have already mentioned above that the sentences *The townspeople are awake* and *All the townspeople are awake*, i.e. with and without the slack regulator *all*, have the same truth conditions and that they only differ in the amount of slack which they tolerate (Lasersohn 1999). Thus, if *íd* is to be interpreted as a slack regulator, the same holds true in the Vedic example. A similar assumption can be made for the interpretation in which *íd* is an exclusive particle, even

⁴²¹ These are not the only mentions of the three steps in this hymn but, again for reasons of space, I only give these three stanzas here.

though these are considered to affect the truth value of a sentence. For since the three steps are a famous image, both the poet and the hearer know that Viṣṇu made three steps, and no more, so that the use of *íd* would be redundant here. Its pragmatic function may, however, be to express the astonishment of the poet regarding the low number of steps Viṣṇu needs. Due to the fact that the effect of the presence or absence of *íd* on the meaning of the sentences in ex. (433) is relatively low, *íd* may be a convenient means for the poet to achieve the exact number of syllables required by the meter. Thus, apart from linguistic reasons, the meter may be one determining factor for presence or absence of *íd*. By suggesting this I do not mean that the meter is the sole factor which determines the use of *íd*. Neither do I suggest that *íd* after quantifiers is expletive. On the contrary, the poet is very aware of its function. I merely assume that its subtle effects on the meaning of a sentence allow for a certain freedom in its use, which the poet presumably exploits.⁴²²

In the following example, *íd* does not occur after a simplex cardinal number but after the multiplicative adjective *saptádhātu-* ‘sevenfold’:

(434) <i>tád</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>sadhástham</i>	<i>abhí</i>	<i>cáru</i>
DEM:ACC.SG.M	PRT	seat:ACC.SG.N	LP	dear:ACC.SG.N
<i>dādhaya</i>	/	<i>gāvo</i>	<i>yác</i>	<i>chāsan</i>
ponder:PERF.1SG		cow:NOM.PL.F	REL:ACC.SG.N	direct:SBJV.3PL
<i>vahatúm</i>		<i>ná</i>	<i>dhenávaḥ</i>	/ [...] <i>yán</i> [...] / <i>abhí</i>
wedding:ACC.SG.M		like	giving.milk:NOM.PL.M	REL:ACC.SG.M LP
<i>vānāsya</i>		<i>saptádhātur</i>	<i>īj</i>	<i>jánaḥ</i>
music:GEN.SG.M		sevenfold:NOM.SG.M	PRT	people:NOM.SG.M

‘Just this dear seat do I ponder, to which the milk-cows will direct (their journey) like a bridal procession, as will [...] the sevenfold people of the music.’ RV 10.32.4

This stanza describes how everyone and everything involved in the sacrifice arrives at the sacrificial ground (Oldenberg 1909–1912: II, 237; Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1428). Literally, the form *saptádhātu-* is a possessive compound (*bahuvrīhi*) which means ‘having seven constituent parts’ (cf. Monier-Williams 1899: 1149). Following Geldner (1951–1957: III, 181), the expression ‘the sevenfold people of the music’ refers to the seven voices of the Ṛṣis, the singers. Jamison (comm.X.2: ad loc.) surmises that thereby the poet alludes to the chanters that participate in the ritual. Assuming that the expression refers to the seven Ṛṣis, i.e. to a fixed group of entities (see Mitchiner 2000 for further details), it seems unlikely that *íd* has an

⁴²² As Daniel Kölligan pointed out to me, *íd* occurs only in the third stanza of this hymn, which comprises six stanzas, i.e. *íd* occurs near the center of the hymn, where important statements are located (see de Macedo 2007: 104–142 for the structure of Rigvedic hymns).

exclusive function here ('the people that is only sevenfold').⁴²³ I find it more plausible that the poet uses *íd* as a slack regulator ('the people of the music who consist of exactly seven members') in order to stress that he is referring to exactly this group of people. In doing so, he further ensures that the hearer understands the reference of this expression, even though it is likely to be understood even without *íd*. Further cases in which *íd* occurs after numerals and in which its exact function I cannot determine are RV 1.155.4, 1.164.15 and 7.18.24. In the first passage, *íd* occurs after the cardinal number *tri*- 'three' and can be interpreted as a scalar exclusive particle or a slack regulator. In the second passage, *íd* occurs after the cardinal number *ṣaṣ*- 'six' and is possibly to be interpreted as an exclusive particle.⁴²⁴ In the third passage it occurs after *saptá*- 'seven'.

With respect to numerals, I have thus far discussed cardinal numbers and the one case in which *íd* occurs after a multiplicative adjective. In one text passage, *íd* occurs after an ordinal numeral:

(435) <i>ātmā</i> breath:NOM.SG.N	<i>pitús</i> food:NOM.SG.M	<i>tanūr</i> body:NOM.SG.M	
<i>vāsa</i> garment:NOM.SG.N	/	<i>ojodā</i> giving.strength:NOM.SG.M	<i>abhiāñjanam</i> / anointment:NOM.SG.N
<i>turīyam</i> fourth:ACC.SG.N	<i>íd</i> PRT	<i>róhitasya</i> red:GEN.SG.M	<i>pākasthāmānam</i> / Pākasthāman:ACC.SG.M
<i>bhojām</i> bountiful:ACC.SG.M	<i>dātāram</i> giver:ACC.SG.M	<i>abravam</i> speak:IPRF.1SG	

'Food is the lifebreath, garments the body, and anointment is the giver of strength. But as the fourth I have proclaimed Pākasthāman, the nurturing giver of the sorrel.' RV 8.3.24

This stanza is the last one of a praise of the gift of Pākasthāman (Geldner 1951–1957: II, 288). It contains a list of three things that are important in life, namely food, garments and anointment. Then, as a fourth member of this list, pāda d names Pākasthāman. As a result, there is an inherent contrast within this list, as the first three members are lifeless entities that are necessary in everyday-life whereas the fourth member is a person and might thus be unexpected to occur in this list (cf. Galjanić 2010: 72f.). Moreover, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1029) describe pādas a/b as "an adage, or adapted piece of folk wisdom, as a foil to further praise of the patron in the second half of the [stanza]". Hence, they (2014: 1031) introduce pāda c with 'but' in their translation. Nonetheless, according to Geldner (1951–1957: II, 288), this stanza expresses that

⁴²³ Note that in the Sūtras, there is in fact an eighth Ṛṣi, who is sometimes "added on" to the others (Mitchiner 2000: 4). Since the eighth Ṛṣi is not attested in the R̥gveda, I will disregard it for my interpretation of *íd*.

⁴²⁴ The former passage deals with Viṣṇu's three strides and the latter one with the division among the seven Ṛṣis (see Mitchiner (2000: 8–11) on this topic).

due to his gift, Pākasthāman is as important as the first three elements.⁴²⁵ This may be a clue to the interpretation of *íd*: Since *turíyam* ‘the fourth’ is an ordinal number, I believe that the presence of *íd* is not related to quantification here. Rather, I assume that its function is to emphasize that Pākasthāman is the fourth member of the same list as the entities mentioned before even though this is unexpected. Yet, I am not sure whether this interpretation is correct.

In addition to the universally quantifying expressions and numerals discussed thus far, *íd* occurs once after the adjective *ubhá-* ‘both’, in a hymn dedicated to the two soma carts:

(436) <i>ubhé</i>		<i>íd</i>	<i>asya</i>		<i>ubháyasya</i>
both:NOM.DU.N		PRT	DEM:GEN.SG.M		of.both.kinds:GEN.SG.M
<i>rājata</i>	/	<i>ubhé</i>		<i>yatete</i>	<i>ubháyasya</i>
rule:3DU		both:NOM.DU.N		place:MID.3DU	of.both.kinds:GEN.SG.M
<i>puṣyataḥ</i>					
thrive:3DU					

‘Both (carts) rule over it [=soma?] of both kinds. Both take their places, and thrive on the one of both kinds.’ RV 10.13.5cd

A major factor which complicates the analysis of *íd* in this text passage is that the referents of the nominal expressions in this text passage are not easy to identify. Whereas Grassmann (1876–1877: II, 465f.) regards both worlds, i.e. Heaven and Earth, as the referents of the subject *ubhé*,⁴²⁶ Griffith (1896–1897: II, 398), Oldenberg (1909–1912: II, 211) and Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1389f.) assume that *ubhé* refers to the two soma carts, which take the soma to the sacrificial ground, as does Geldner (1951–1957: III, 142) judging from his comment. I follow this latter view. However, Jamison & Brereton argue that in addition to the ‘literal’ referents, i.e. the two carts, *ubhé* also alludes to the god Indra and the first male human Yama. Identifying the referent of the genitive *asya ubháyasya* ‘this of both kinds’ appears to be more difficult. Grassmann regards Soma oblation and song as the referents; Griffith, who does not interpret *asya ubháyasya* as one complex nominal expression, believes that *ubháyasya* refers to Gods and men; according to Oldenberg, it refers to the events described in pādas a and b; Jamison & Brereton, in accordance with Geldner, tentatively assume that it refers to pure and mixed soma. As for *íd*, Klein (2012: 74) interprets it as an exclusive particle here and translates ‘Both (wagons) alone have in their possession both of it (i.e. the soma, some on each wagon)’. Alternatively, it is possible that *íd* is used as a slack regulator in this case. Interestingly, the two soma carts, which are probably the referents of *ubhé*, are never explicitly mentioned in the entire hymn, even though it is dedicated to them (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1387). As a result,

⁴²⁵ Galjanić (2010: 72f.) even regards it as ‘the best’.

⁴²⁶ Grassmann claims that the entire hymn is dedicated to Heaven and Earth instead of the two chariot carts.

íd may have a function that is unrelated to the semantics of *ubhé* but rather serve to identify the referents in the current hymn. Recall that ex. (154) of Section 4.4 is the only attestation of *cid* after *ubhá-*. There, I have not been able to determine its function either.

In this section, I have examined the function of *íd* after quantifying expressions. I have shown that *íd* functions as a slack regulator when it appears after universally quantifying expressions, i.e. it decreases the tolerance of exceptions (exx. (211)–(214)). After numerals, its exact function is more difficult to determine. In most cases, it is exceedingly difficult to distinguish between a use as an exclusive particle and one as a slack regulator. In the one case where *íd* occurs after an ordinal number (ex. (435)), its function differs from the other examples examined in this section.

5.4.2 *íd* after *āmreḍitas*

Another formation which is related to quantifying expressions in Vedic are the so-called *āmreḍitas* or iterative compounds. These compounds are formed by the exact repetition of the entire word form, the only difference being the lack of accent on the repeated form (Collitz 1882: 287). For a typology such compounds in the Rigveda see Ditrich (2011). On *āmreḍitas* in Vedic prose see Grieco (2023a, 2023b). In the Rigveda, there are 18 passages in which *íd* occurs after *āmreḍitas*.⁴²⁷ Klein (2003: 775) elaborates that nominal *āmreḍitas* typically express perpetual repetition, which may also lead to a universally quantifying interpretation (cf. Lühr 1997: 62). Consider the following example containing the nominal *āmreḍita pányam-panyam*:

(437) <i>pányam-panyam</i>		<i>ít</i>	<i>sotāra</i>	/
astonishing:ACC.SG.M-astonishing:ACC.SG.M		PRT	presser:VOC.PL.M	
<i>á</i>	<i>dhāvata</i>	<i>mádiyāya</i>		/
LP	rinse:IMP.2PL	drink.drinker:DAT.SG.M		
<i>sómaṃ</i>	<i>vīrāya</i>	<i>śúrāya</i>		
Soma:ACC.SG.M	hero:DAT.SG.M	champion:DAT.SG.M		

‘Pressers, rinse the soma that is ever to be admired for the one to be exhilarated, for the hero, the champion.’ RV 8.2.25

The nominal *pánya-* in its simplex form means ‘praiseworthy’. Following the translations by Klein (2003: 784) and Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1027), the *āmreḍita* expresses the meaning ‘ever-praiseworthy’. Hence, the semantics of the *āmreḍita* is comparable to that of universally quantifying expressions like *sádam* ‘always’ and *śásvant-* ‘perpetual’, which I have discussed in Section 5.4.1. As a result, I assume that the function of *íd* in ex. (437), which Klein (2003:

⁴²⁷ According to Klein (2003: 784) there are 16 such passages. Unlike me, he does not count repetitions, so that he subtracts two passages.

(440), where *íd* occurs after the iterative *úpa-upa* in order to express that the event occurs with unrestricted continuity and thus is comparable with the function in ex. (437):

(440) <i>úpopén</i> [= <i>úpa-upa íd</i>]	<i>nú</i>	<i>maghavan</i>		<i>bhū́ya</i>
LP+LP+PRT	now	generous:VOC.SG.M		much:COMP.NOM.SG.N
<i>ín</i>	<i>nú</i>	<i>te</i>	/	<i>dānam</i>
PRT	now	2SG.GEN		gift:NOM.SG.N
				<i>devásya</i>
				god:GEN.SG.M
<i>prcyate</i>				
fill:PASS.3SG				

‘Over and over, more and more, the gift coming from you, the god, becomes engorged, o generous one.’⁴³¹ RV 8.51.7cd

Here, interestingly, the continuous growth is further underlined by the comparative *bhū́ya* ‘more’, which is, like *úpa-upa*, followed by the particles *íd nú* too, so that Jamison (comm.VIII.2: ad loc.) speaks of an “over-the-top piling up of particles and similar items”. Even though according to Klein (2003: 789) such an iterative reading is possible, Dunkel (1981: 215) explicitly assigns an intensive meaning to *úpa-upa* in this text passage. In such an interpretation, the function of *íd* is probably that of *íd* after simple local particles (cf. Section 5.9), which means that it functions as an emphasizer. In the following case, Klein (2003: 789f.) assigns the local particle *āmreḍita* “a sense of preeminence that approaches superlativity”:

(441) <i>prá-prét</i> [= <i>prá-pra íd</i>]	<i>te</i>	<i>agne</i>		<i>vanúśaḥ</i>
LP-LP+PRT	2SG.GEN	Agni:VOC.SG.M		devoted:NOM.PL.M
<i>siyāma</i>				
be:OPT.1PL				

‘May we be preeminent/at the very fore/before all as thy worshippers, O Agni.’⁴³²

‘Zealous for you, o Agni, might we become more and more preeminent’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 327) RV 1.150.3c

Klein does not comment on the function of *íd* in this case specifically, but he (2003: 784) states that *íd* after local particle *āmreḍitas* has emphatic function. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 327) assign an iterative meaning to the *āmreḍita*. If this is to be interpreted as a continuous process without an endpoint, the function of *íd* may then be that of a slack regulator, which it fulfills after universal quantifiers.⁴³³ The most unclear case in which *íd* follows a local particle *āmreḍita* is the following text passage, which occurs in the last hymn of the Rigveda:

(442) <i>sám-sam</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>yuvase</i>	<i>vṛṣann</i>	/	<i>ágne</i>
LP-LP	PRT	separate:MID.2SG	bull:VOC.SG.M		Agni:VOC.SG.M

⁴³¹ I have added the translation of the vocative ‘o generous one’, which appears to be omitted in the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1135).

⁴³² The translation is adopted from Klein (2003: 790); italics are his.

⁴³³ Oldenberg (1897: 178) translates ‘May we, O Agni, addicted to thee, be always foremost’ (see also Velankar 1963a: 33). In Greek, the form *ποπρό* means ‘on and on’ (‘fort und fort’) (Collitz 1882: 291).

<i>viśvāni</i>	<i>aryá</i>	<i>á</i>
all:ACC.PL.N	stranger:ABL.SG.M	LP

‘Over and over, o Agni, you bull, you wrest together all things from the stranger.’ RV 10.191.1ab

Here, Dunkel (1981: 216) assigns a distributive meaning to *sám-sam*, which he believes to be “contextually reinforced by the generalizing *viśvāni*”. He translates ‘Altogether, O bull Agni, do you snatch for yourself all (the goods = *vásūni* in d) away from the stranger’. In contrast, Klein (2003: 789) assigns it an intensive meaning, which he also assumes to be enhanced by *viśvāni* ‘all’, but also by *íd*. Klein translates ‘*All together*, O Agni, thou dost take for thyself all (the goods) of the stranger, O bull’ (italics are his). A third interpretation, viz. an iterative one, appears to underlie the translation ‘over and over’ by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1661), which is given in ex. (442). As in this text passage the meaning of *sám-sam* is uncertain, the function of *íd* remains of equal uncertainty.

A further complicated case is the following example, in which *íd* occurs after an *āmreḍita* that is formed from the pronominal adjective *anyá-*:

(443) <i>áyatantā</i>	<i>carato</i>	<i>anyád-anyad</i>	<i>íd</i> /
NEG.strive:PRS.PTCP.ACTNOM.DU.M	go:3DU	other:ACC.SG.N-other:ACC.SG.N	PRT
<i>yá</i>	<i>cakāra</i>	<i>vayúnā</i>	<i>bráhmanas</i>
REL:ACC.PL.N	do:PERF.3SG	sphere:ACC.PL.N	prayer:GEN.SG.N
<i>pátiḥ</i>			
lord:NOM.SG.M			

‘Not striving (with each other) the two wander *each into another* (*sphere*) (according to) the demarcative spheres which Brahmanaspati made.’⁴³⁴ RV 2.24.5cd

The interpretation of this text passage is problematic (Griffith 1896–1897: I, 289; Oldenberg 1909–1912: I, 207f.; Jamison comm.II). First of all, it is not clear who the referent of the subject is. Klein (2003: 784) follows Ludwig (1876–1888: V, 281) and Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 207f.) in assuming that ‘sun and moon’ are the subject and so do Renou (1955–1969: XV, 57), Schmidt (1968: 232), Witzel & Gotō (2007: 803) and Jamison & Brereton (2014: 436).⁴³⁵ In contrast, as Geldner (1951–1957: I, 306) remarks, Sāyaṇa regards heaven and earth as the subject, whereas Geldner himself believes that it refers to two parties, the gods and the fathers (cf. also Geldner 1901: 19). A second uncertainty, which is even more problematic for the interpretation of *íd*, is what is meant by *caratas anyád-anyad*. Consider the following translations of pāda c:

⁴³⁴ The translation is adopted from Klein (2003: 784); italics are his.

⁴³⁵ Schmidt (1968: 232) identifies the sun with the day and the moon with the night. See also Jamison (comm.II: ad loc.) on this matter.

α. ‘The two [=the sun and moon], not lining up (next to each other), move to one (pattern) or the other’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 436)

β. ‘Without jealousy, both go into another (direction) each’ (Geldner)⁴³⁶

γ. ‘(But now, because of Bṛhaspati’s deed), the two (sun and moon) wander without relating (the orders of their movement, i.e. each independent in its movement), each according to another (order)’ (Oldenberg 1909–1912: I, 208)⁴³⁷

δ. ‘Effortless they pass on to perfect this and that’ (Griffith 1896–1897: I, 289)

The translations in α–γ, as well as that in ex. (443) interpret *vayúna-*, which is mentioned in pāda d, as the elliptical head of *anyád-anyad*. According to their interpretation of this word, they render it as ‘sphere’, ‘pattern’, ‘direction’ or ‘order’, respectively (cf. also Renou 1955–1969: XII, 91; XV, 57, Witzel & Gotō 2007: 390 and Jamison comm.II: ad loc.). For a detailed discussion of this word see Thieme (1949: 13–25). The translation by Griffith in δ sticks out because it does not associate *anyád-anyad* with *vayú-* and it also renders the verb *car-* as ‘perfect’ instead of ‘move’. In his analysis of the *āmreḍita*, Klein (2003: 784) contends that in contrast to the other instances of *anyá-anya-* in the Rigveda, the one discussed here has a distributive meaning, because sun and moon reign over their respective realm. This assumption is in accordance with the translations in β and γ, albeit the different opinion regarding the referents by Geldner. Klein considers this to be the only instance of *anyá-anya-* with distributive meaning and since this is the only instance of this *āmreḍita* followed by *íd*, he believes that the particle contributes to the distributive interpretation: He (2003: 784) believes that it has exclusive function here in that it „circumscrib[es] the realm of each and thereby clarif[ies] the value of the *āmreḍita*”. In order to evaluate Klein’s hypothesis regarding the function of *íd* in ex. (443), it might be helpful to consider the function(s) of *íd* when it follows the simplex *anyá-* ‘other’. Throughout the Rigveda, there is only one such case attested, viz. the following text passage:

(444) <i>yásya</i>	<i>prayāṇam</i>	<i>ánu</i>	<i>anyá</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>yayúr</i>	/
REL:GEN.SG.M	lead:ACC.SG.N	LP	other:NOM.PL.M	PRT	go:PERF.3PL	
<i>devā</i>	<i>devásya</i>	<i>mahimānam</i>	<i>ójasā</i>		/	
god:NOM.PL.M	god:GEN.SG.M	might:ACC.SG.M	power:INS.SG.N			
[...]	<i>sá</i>	<i>étašo</i>	/	<i>rájāmsi</i>		
	DEM:NOM.SG.M	steed:NOM.SG.M		space:ACC.PL.N		

⁴³⁶ ‘Ohne Eifersucht gehen beide je eine andere (Richtung)’.

⁴³⁷ ‘(Nun aber, durch des Bṛhaspati’s Tat) wandeln die beiden (Sonne und Mond), ohne (die Ordnungen ihrer Bewegung mit einander) in Zusammenhang zu bringen (d. h. jedes in seinen Bewegungen selbständig), jedes nach anderer (Ordnung)’.

<i>deváh</i>	<i>savitā́</i>	<i>mahitvanā́</i>
god:NOM.SG.M	Savitar:NOM.SG.M	greatness:INS.SG.N

‘Whose lead the others have followed: the gods (following) the might of the god with their power; who measured out the earthly (spaces)—he, the steed [Etaśa], (also) measured out the (heavenly) spaces with his greatness: god Savitar.’ RV 5.81.3

Unfortunately, the function of *íd* in this passage is not clear. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 764) simply leave it untranslated and so do Geldner & Kaegi (1875: 49), Geldner (1951–1957: II, 85) and Renou (1955–1969: XV, 24) and Velankar (2003: 124).⁴³⁸ Within this text passage, I do not find any contextual clues which facilitate an interpretation of *íd*.⁴³⁹ As a result, simplex *anyá-* followed by *íd* is not eligible as a clue towards the function of *íd* in ex. (443). However, as has been the case before in this study, taking into account inner-Sanskrit parallels may be useful. For in later Sanskrit, the particle *eva* may occur together with *anya-* and as I have already mentioned, *eva* is considered to have functions similar to Rigvedic *íd*. Regarding *anya- eva*, Gillon (1999: 119) states that this collocation can be paraphrased in English as ‘completely different’. The fact that Rigvedic *íd* and later *eva* often have similar functions allows for the assumption that the collocation *anyá- íd* may also express the meaning ‘completely different’ in the Rigveda. Such a function of *íd* (like that of *eva*) would be in accordance with the one it fulfills after universal quantifiers: It emphasizes the fact that there is no exception, i.e. that there is not a single trait of entity X that is identical to a trait of entity Y. This analysis supports the interpretation of ex. (443) by Klein (2003: 784), because *anyád-anyad íd* would then express that ‘the two wander each into a completely different (sphere)’, i.e. stressing the fact that they never cross paths. The fact that *íd* does not have this function in ex. (444) is not necessarily an argument against this interpretation. For there, *anyé* has the meaning ‘the others’ whereas in ex. (443) it means ‘different’.

However, in light of the translation by Jamison & Brereton in α , Klein’s interpretation does not appear to be certain anymore. My understanding of their translation is that the simultaneous movement of the sun and the moon is considered to be a pattern, even though in this movement pattern they do not line up next to each other. These patterns then may occur one after the other (day followed by night?), so that an iterative interpretation of *anyá-anya-* is

⁴³⁸ I am not certain whether Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 225) intends ‘wieder’ (‘again, yet (?)’) to be the translation of *íd*: ‘Und seinem Vorgang folgen wieder andre nach’. Similarly, Witzel et al. (2013: 334) translate ‘(Er), nach dessen Ausfahrt wiederum die anderen gefahren kommen’. Griffith (1896–1897: I, 548) begins his translation with ‘Even he’. Hence, assuming that he considers *íd* to have additive function here, he does not seem to regard it as associated with *anyé*.

⁴³⁹ There is no basis for assuming that *íd* is involved here in the disambiguation between *anyá-* ‘another’ and ‘the other’ (see Jamison 1997 on this topic). Neither do I assume that *íd* can be interpreted as expressing universal quantification, for I find such a reading when *íd* occurs after the nominal predicate and not after the subject (Section 5.7).

possible in this text passage as well. The question is then, however, what the function of *íd* might be in such an interpretation.

The Rigveda exhibits only two text passages containing a verbal *āmreḍita*. In both cases, it is the imperative *pībā-piba* ‘drink’, which is followed by *íd*:

(445) *pībā-pibéd* [= *pībā-piba íd*] *indra* *śūra*
 drink:IMP.2SG-drink:IMP.2SG+PRT Indra:VOC.SG.M champion:VOC.SG.M

sómam
 soma:ACC.SG.M

‘Drink and drink the soma, o Indra, our champion!’ RV 2.11.11a

The second clause containing this imperative, RV 10.22.15a, is an exact repetition of this pāda. Klein (2003: 794) believes that the verbal *āmreḍita* in ex. (445) expresses iteration. The value of *íd* he (2003: 793) considers to be emphatic. I agree with his analysis but it is difficult to tell whether *íd* is used here to emphasize the iterative, i.e. quantifying, meaning of the *āmreḍita* or whether it has the adhortative function it exhibits also after non-*āmreḍita* imperatives. In Section 5.8 I will argue that *íd* after imperatives usually links the request to the preceding clause. As I will show, only for ex. (445) but not for the identical pāda RV 10.22.15a do I find this relation with the preceding context, which suggests that at least in the second passage it functions as a slack regulator. Yet, since there are no other contexts in which an examination of *íd* after such a form is possible, its exact function is difficult to determine.

Klein (2003: 793) and Dunkel (1981: 223) regard the structure in ex. (395) as equivalent to the structure in the following example, in which two identical imperatives follow each other, likewise followed by *íd*, but are not marked as compounds in the transmission of the text (cf. also Klein 2001 [2004]: 253f.):

(446) *stuhí* *stuhíd* [= *stuhí íd*] *eté* *ghā* *te* /
 praise:IMP.2SG praise:IMP.2SG+PRT DEM:NOM.PL.M PRT 2SG.GEN

māṃhiṣṭhāso *maghónām*
 liberal:SUP.NOM.PL.M generous:GEN.PL.M

‘Praise (them)! **Just** praise (them)! They are the most bounteous of bounty among your bounteous ones’ RV 8.1.30ab

Notice that in ex. (446), the second imperative *stuhí* is marked as stressed on the final syllable. However, the final *i* of the second imperative is contracted with the accented *í* of *íd*. Therefore, it is not possible to tell whether the second imperative is accented, as would be expected when two finite verbs follow each other, or whether it is unaccented, as in an *āmreḍita* (Klein 2003: 793). In other words, the contracted form *stuhíd* may also be resolved as *stuhi íd* in the example. Regarding the function of *íd*, a connection with the previous stanza is observable. For it is

concerned with the speaker’s praise songs, so that a connection with the imperative *stuhí* can be assumed. I give the preceding stanza here, for reasons of space, without glosses:

(447) *máma tvā sūra údite / máma madhyāmdine diváh / máma prapitvé apisarvaré vasav / ā stómāso avrtsata*

‘Mine are the **praises** when the sun has risen, mine at the day’s midday, mine in the evening at the border of night, that have turned you here, o good one.’ RV 8.1.29

If the two imperatives in ex. (446) are to be regarded as separate word forms, it is possible to assume that *íd* is used to put further emphasis on the second form, i.e. to increase the urgency of the request even more than it is already done by repeating the imperative.

The last group of *āmreḍitas* that I will discuss in this section are those which consist of pronouns, the largest group of *āmreḍitas* that occur with *íd*. In 8 instances, *íd* occurs after a demonstrative *āmreḍita* and in one instance, it occurs after a personal pronoun *āmreḍita*. The former group has been investigated by de Vaan (2015: 43–45). Consider the following text passage:

(448) <i>tām-tam</i>		<i>íd</i>	<i>rādhase</i>	<i>mahá</i>	/
DEM:ACC.SG.M-DEM:ACC.SG.M		PRT	generosity:DAT.SG.N	great:DAT.SG.N	
<i>índraṃ</i>	<i>codāmi</i>	<i>pītāye</i>	/	<i>yáh</i>	
Indra:ACC.SG.M	impel:1SG	drink:DAT.SG.F		REL:NOM.SG.M	
<i>pūrviyām</i>	<i>ānuṣṭutim</i>	/	<i>īše</i>		
earlier:ACC.SG.F	praise:ACC.SG.F		own:PERF.MID.3SG		
<i>kṛṣṭīnām</i>	<i>nṛtúḥ</i>				
community:GEN.PL.F	dancer:NOM.SG.M				

‘Him and him **alone**, Indra, do I impel to drink, for the sake of his great generosity—the dancer who holds sway over the communities, according to the ancient praise that follows him.’ RV 8.68.7

Hettrich (1988: 557f.) assumes that correlative *āmreḍitas* have a generalizing meaning but regarding this passage, he concedes that it probably has emphatic meaning (‘gerade diesen (Indra)’). Accordingly, de Vaan (2015: 44) acknowledges that *tām-tam* is regarded as emphatic by several scholars, but he follows Lejeune (1979: 211) in assuming that theoretically, it can also be interpreted as iterative because Indra is impelled to drink repeatedly.⁴⁴⁰ This raises the question of how demonstrative *āmreḍitas* are to be interpreted. With respect to this, de Vaan (2015: 44f.) observes that they can occur with or without *íd* and with or without a dependent relative clause. He makes the following generalizations with respect to this distribution:

- 1 If there is no relative clause, *íd* is always used; and
- 2 whenever there is a relative clause, *íd* appears when the main clause precedes the subclause (RV 8.68.7), but, when the relative clause precedes, *íd* can be absent (1.162,19, 10.125.5) or present (1.132.6b and c).

⁴⁴⁰ Lejeune (1979: 211) suggests ‘c’est lui, toujours lui, à chaque fois lui’ as a translation of *tām-tam*.

De Vaan assumes that the presence of *íd* or a relative clause indicates an emphatic reading of the pronoun. As I understand his analysis, he assumes that demonstrative *āmreḍitas* in the Rigveda have in general a generalizing meaning (cf. de Vaan 2015: 50), but since they are always accompanied by *íd* or a relative clause they are not to be interpreted as generalizing, which means they are emphatic.⁴⁴¹ As the reason for his first generalization and for the presence of *íd* after demonstrative *āmreḍitas* that precede the relative clause, de Vaan assumes the exclusive use of *íd*. He follows Klein (2003: 784; 786), who surmises that *íd* may serve as a clue to the interpretation of an *āmreḍita* (cf. the discussion of ex. (443)) and who also contends that *íd* usually has exclusive function when it occurs with a pronominal *āmreḍita*. As a result, de Vaan (2015: 43–45) believes that in connection with a demonstrative *āmreḍita*, the exclusive particle signals that the *āmreḍita* is used referentially and not in its generalizing function. Similarly, he assigns a restrictive function to relative pronouns. However, with respect to *íd*, the Rigvedic data suggest that this conclusion is doubtful for two reasons: Firstly, de Vaan disregards the fact that *íd* occurs with quantifying expressions as well as with other iterative *āmreḍitas* and it does not have delimiting or exclusive function, as my preceding discussion has shown; on the contrary, as a slack regulator it emphasizes the quantification. This makes it rather unsuitable as a means of disambiguation. Secondly, the data suggest that *íd* and iterative demonstrative *āmreḍitas* are not necessarily in complementary distribution. Compare the following text passages:

(449) *tá* *īm* *vardhanti* *máhi*
 DEM:NOM.PL.F ACC.SG.N? strengthen:3PL great:ACC.SG.N
asya *paúṃsiyaṃ* [...] //
 DEM:GEN.SG.M manly.power:ACC.SG.N

tát-tad *íd* *asya*
 DEM:ACC.SG.N-DEM:ACC.SG.N PRT DEM:GEN.SG.M

paúṃsiyaṃ *grṇīmasi*
 manly.power:ACC.SG.N sing:1PL

‘3. These (females) strengthen that great masculine nature of his; [...]

4. It is **just** this very masculine nature of his that we sing’ RV 1.155.3–4a

(450) *yó* *vācá* *vívāco*
 REL:NOM.SG.M speech:INS.SG.F with.disputatious.speech:ACC.PL.M
mṛdhrāvācaḥ / *purú* *sahásrā*
 with.insulting.speech:ACC.PL.M many:ACC.PL.N thousand:ACC.PL.N
ásivā *jaghāna* / *tát-tad* *íd*
 hostile:ACC.PL.N hit:PERF.3SG DEM:ACC.SG.N-DEM:ACC.SG.N PRT

⁴⁴¹ Two instances of *idám-idam* occur neither with *íd* nor with a relative clause but de Vaan (2015: 44f.) excludes these because they are used adverbially.

<i>asya</i>	<i>paúṁsiyaṁ</i>	<i>grṇīmasi</i>
DEM:GEN.SG.M	manly.power:ACC.SG.N	sing:1PL

‘He who smote with his speech those of disputatious speech, those of insulting speech, and many thousands of the hostile, this and every (other) masculine deed of his do we sing’ RV 10.23.5a–c

As the comparison of these examples shows, pāda c of ex. (450) is an exact repetition of pāda 4a of ex. (449). Nevertheless, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 332; 1408), like Geldner (1951–1957: I, 213; III, 160), assume an emphatic function of *tát-tad* in ex. (449) but a distributive one in ex. (450).⁴⁴² Jamison (comm.I.2: ad loc.) explains that she assumes different functions of *tát-tad* because of the different contexts in which the sentence occurs. Accordingly, I assume that *íd* has exclusive function in ex. (449), whereas in ex. (450) it functions as a slack regulator, emphasizing the universal quantification. I therefore disagree with the analysis by de Vaan (2015: 43–45) that *íd* renders a demonstrative *āmreḍita* emphatic (or at least not generalizing), although I must concede that Jamison & Brereton’s interpretation of ex. (450) is not compelling.⁴⁴³ However, a further case which supports my view is the following example containing a personal pronoun *āmreḍita*.⁴⁴⁴

(451) <i>vayaṁ</i>	<i>tuvābhí</i>	<i>nonumaḥ</i>	/	<i>asmāṁ-asmāṁ</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>úd</i>
1PL.NOM	2SG.ACC+LP	shout:1PL		1PL.ACC-1PL.ACC	PRT	LP
<i>ava</i>						
help:IMP.2SG						

‘we repeatedly shout unto thee. Aid *us alone* always!’⁴⁴⁵ RV 4.32.4bc

With respect to this example, Klein (2003: 786) himself observes that the *āmreḍita* appears “to show an iterative-durative value (‘we/you/us always’) augmented, in some instances, with a sense of exclusiveness (with or without *íd*)”. According to this interpretation, the *āmreḍita* expresses iterativity or durativity despite the presence of an exclusive *íd*, so that the presence of *íd* cannot indicate the absence of an iterative-durative reading. Notice, however, that in this example, a reading of *íd* as a slack regulator is possible as well. This is due to the fact that *asmāṁ-asmāṁ* is on the one hand referential and on the other hand quantifying. Nevertheless, I find it difficult to assume with Klein (2003: 784; 786) and de Vaan (2015: 45) that *íd* serves to disambiguate the meaning of an *āmreḍita* when it can have more than one function itself.

⁴⁴² Klein does not seem to assume different interpretations for the two formally identical pādas, for he (2003: 784f.) disregards repetitions in his statistics.

Geldner translates RV 1.155.4a as ‘Gerade diese Mannestat von ihm preisen wir’ and RV 10.23.5a as ‘Diese und jene Mannestat von ihm besingen wir’.

⁴⁴³ Remember, however, that also ex. (448) has not unequivocally been analyzed as emphatic in the literature.

⁴⁴⁴ De Vaan (2015:43–45) examines only demonstrative and not personal pronouns.

⁴⁴⁵ The translation is adopted from Klein (2003: 786); italics are his.

This section has been dedicated to the examination of *íd* after *āmreḍita*. Similarly to numerals, it has been difficult to determine its function in this context. The problem here is that the interpretation of *íd* in most cases has to be based on the interpretation of the *āmreḍita*, which is often debatable. Even in those cases in which the *āmreḍita* can be interpreted as iterative and equatable with a universal quantifier, *íd* does not necessarily have the function of a slack regulator, as ex. (451) shows.

5.5 *íd* as an intensifier

This section is concerned with the possible use of Vedic *íd* that resembles the employment of focus particles but does not fall under this category, namely its use as an intensifier. This use is not very prominent in descriptions of *íd* in grammars or dictionaries. Yet, in his grammar, Renou (1952: 375) gives ‘c’est lui-même’ next to ‘lui seul’ as a translation for *sá íd*. Also, in several instances this function is recognizable in translations of the Rigveda. In this section, I will discuss these cases.

I follow the terminology of König & Gast (2006: 223f.) who use the term INTENSIFIER “for expressions like English *himself/herself/itself* when they are used in an adjunct position (e.g., *the president himself*), for Latin *ipse/ipsa/ipsum*, Italian *stesso/stessa*, Russian *sam/samá/samó*, German *selbst*, etc., and their counterparts in other languages”.⁴⁴⁶ As König & Gast (2006: 227) explain, intensifiers exhibit several similarities with focus particles but nevertheless, they should not be treated alike. Thus, König (1991: 87–96) treats intensifiers in his chapter on additive focus particles, which points to their similarity, but König & Gast (2006: 227) argue that intensifiers are not to be analyzed as focus particles. They explain that unlike focus particles, intensifiers are always stressed and are in several languages inflectable (see the examples above). From a semantic point of view, they find that in contrast to focus particles, intensifiers involve no quantification over alternatives.

Intensifiers can be used in different ways. The following overview, quoted from König & Gast (2006: 224), illustrates the different uses:

(452) Use types of intensifiers

a. the ADNOMINAL use

Writers themselves, rather than their works, should be examined for their sense of social responsibility.

⁴⁴⁶ Notice that the term INTENSIFIER is to be distinguished from INTENSIFICATORY, which I introduced in Section 5.3.

b. the ADVERBIAL-EXCLUSIVE use (\cong ‘on one’s own, alone’)

*Mrs. Dalloway wanted to buy the flowers **herself**.*

c. the ADVERBIAL-INCLUSIVE use (\cong ‘too’)

*Mr. Salmon was all right, though. You see, he’d once been a costermonger **himself**, but that was before he married Miss Roach, the baker’s daughter.*
[British National Corpus]

d. the ATTRIBUTIVE use

*Mind your **own** business!*⁴⁴⁷

Regarding the Vedic particle *íd*, a comparison with particles in other languages/varieties suggests that the possibility that *íd* might function as an intensifier is not to be neglected. In order to identify the functions of *íd* in previous sections, I have made use of the similar employment that the particle *hii* in Hindi exhibits. And indeed, Varma (2006) finds that *hii* can be used as an intensifier. One of the examples that he (2006: 102f.) gives is the following:

(453) *miiT* ***hii*** *Thiik* *nahII* *thaa.*
meat **hii** alright NEG be:IPFV.PST.M.SG

‘The MEAT **itself** wasn’t right.’

Another particle that generally exhibits similar functions to Rigvedic *íd* is *eva* in Classical Sanskrit. For this particle, Gillon (1999: 118f.) describes a function as an intensifier as well. He speaks of an “emphatic” use of *eva*, but he gives the following example of this use:

(454) *Devadattaḥ* *eva* *Pāṭaliputram* *agacchat.*
Devadatta:NOM.SG.M PRT Pāṭaliputra:ACC.SG.M go:IPRF.3SG

‘**Only** Devadatta went to Pāṭaliputra.’

‘Devadatta **himself** went to Pāṭaliputra.’⁴⁴⁸

Gillon notes that when *eva* occurs after a nominal it is ambiguous between its exclusive and emphatic use. Like this example from Classical Sanskrit, ex. (453) from Hindi also shows the adnominal use of intensifying *hii* and the other examples that Varma (2006: 102f.) gives are of this type too. König & Gast (2006: 228) follow Eckardt (2001 [2002]) and Hole (2008) and assume that adnominally used intensifiers denote a function whose input is identical with its output. Since the intensifier and thereby the identity function is always in focus, other functions whose input and output are entities of the same kind are evoked as alternatives. As one such function they give SECRETARY.OF so that a possible alternative to *the president himself* is *the secretary of the president*. Assuming that Peter is the President and Paul is his secretary, the identity function and the SECRETARY.OF function have the same input (Peter) but different outputs (Peter vs. Paul). Based on earlier work (see the references there), König & Gast (2006: 230) give the following list of contexts in which adnominal reflexives may occur:

⁴⁴⁷ König & Gast (2006) use non-italics to highlight the intensifier.

⁴⁴⁸ Gillon uses italics instead of boldface type in the translations; the glosses are mine.

The use of an intensifier in combination with an NP α referring to a referent x is possible iff α contrasts with some NP β referring to an individual y and:

- a. x has a higher position than y in a hierarchy, or
- b. x is more significant than y in a specific situation, or
- c. x is defined in terms of y , or
- d. x is the center of perspective.

In the Hindi example above, factor b seems to be at play. Turning now to the Rigvedic data, in the following example it seems plausible to assume an intensifying function for *íd*:

(455) <i>hiraṇyaśṛṅgo</i> with.golden.horns:NOM.SG.M	<i>áyo</i> copper:NOM.SG.N	<i>asya</i> DEM:GEN.SG.M	
<i>pādā</i> foot:NOM.DU.M	/	<i>mánojavā</i> swift.as.thought:NOM.SG.M	<i>ávara</i> lower:LOC.SG.N
<i>índra</i> Indra:NOM.SG.M	<i>āsīt</i> be:IPRF.3SG	/	<i>devā</i> god:NOM.PL.M
<i>asya</i> DEM:GEN.SG.M	<i>hvirádyam</i> eating.of.oblation:ACC.SG.N	<i>āyan</i> go:IPRF.3PL	<i>íd</i> PRT
<i>yó</i> REL:NOM.SG.M	<i>árvantam</i> steed:ACC.SG.M	<i>prathamó</i> first:NOM.SG.M	<i>adhyátiṣṭhat</i> LP.stand:IPRF.3SG

‘9. Having golden horns [=rays], his feet copper, swift as thought he was (an) Indra in the lower (realm). The gods **themselves** came to eat the oblation of him, who first mounted the steed.’ RV 1.163.9

In this passage, *íd* follows *devās* ‘the gods’, which suggests an adnominal use. Moreover, it is probably factor a. that is at play here, i.e. the gods came and not only images of them or their subjects etc. With respect to *hii*, Varma (2006: 101) explains that since in this use the particle indicates a high point on a scale, Hindi speakers identify it with English *even*. This similarity can also be observed for *íd* in ex. (455), for Geldner (1907–1909: I, 27) interprets it as ‘sogar, vielmehr’ and Witzel & Gotō (2007: 294) translate it as ‘sogar’.⁴⁴⁹ This similarity and the difficulty to distinguish between these uses is reflected by the fact that, as mentioned above, König (1991) groups identifiers together with additive particles. Even though the interpretation of *íd* as an intensifier is plausible in this example, it appears to be quite rare in the Rigveda, or at least it is reflected in the translations only rarely. According to my count, Witzel & Gotō (2007) and Witzel et al. (2013) translate it once as an intensifier.⁴⁵⁰ Jamison & Brereton (2014) translate it in 6 instances as an intensifier. In one further instance, both Geldner (1951–1957: II, 286) and Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1030) translate it as ‘eigen’/‘own’.⁴⁵¹ This is the following passage:

⁴⁴⁹ ‘Die Götter sogar gingen zu dessen Speise als Opfergabe, der als erster den Renner bestieg’ (Witzel & Gotō).

⁴⁵⁰ The translation by Witzel & Gotō (2007) and Witzel et al. (2013) comprises only books 1–5.

⁴⁵¹ Another passage where Jamison & Brereton probably use ‘own’ as a translation for *íd* is ex. (380) in Section 5.2.

(456) <i>asyéd</i> [= <i>asyá id</i>]	<i>índro</i>	<i>vāvṛdhe</i>
DEM:GEN.SG.M+PRT	Indra:NOM.SG.M	increase:PERF.MID.3SG
<i>vṛṣṇiyam</i>	<i>śávo</i>	/ <i>máde</i>
bullish:ACC.SG.N	power:ACC.SG.N	exhilaration:LOC.SG.M
<i>sutásya</i>	<i>víṣṇavi</i>	
press:PPP.GEN.SG.M	Viṣṇu:LOC.SG.M	

‘Indra increased his **own** bullish vast power in the exhilaration of the pressed (soma) in the company of Viṣṇu.’ RV 8.3.8ab

Notice that in spite of the translation, *íd* is not to be regarded as an attributive intensifier, because it occurs with a demonstrative in the genitive and is therefore comparable to an expression like *the car of the president himself*. See, however, ex. (381) in Section 5.2, where *íd* follows the attributive intensifier *svá-*. The focus on the identity function that is expressed by intensifiers becomes visible especially in the following passage dedicated to Agni:

(457) <i>tám</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>yahvám</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>ródasī</i>	/
DEM:ACC.SG.M	PRT	youthful:ACC.SG.M	NEG	world.halves:NOM.DU.F	
<i>pári</i>	<i>śrávo</i>	<i>babhūvatuḥ</i>			
LP	fame:ACC.SG.N	become:PERF.3DU			

‘the two world-halves do not encompass him, though youthful, nor his fame.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 679)

‘Ihn **selbst**, den Jugendfrischen, haben nicht Himmel und Erde, (seinen) Ruhm haben (sie nicht) umfassen können.’ (Witzel et al. 2013: 236) RV 5.16.4cd

As can be seen in the example, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 679) leave *íd* untranslated. Oldenberg (1897: 401) translates ‘Him indeed, the vigorous one, his glory the two worlds could not encompass’. The interpretation of *íd* that I endorse would lead to the translation ‘the two world-halves do not encompass him himself, ...’, which sounds somewhat unnatural in English. It works better in the German translation by Witzel et al. (2013: 236), which I have given in the example. To make the function of *íd* even more clear, one might paraphrase the translation as ‘weder ihn selbst noch seinen Ruhm...’ (‘neither him himself nor his fame ...’). Hence, in this example, the fame of Agni is an overt alternative to Agni himself. One of the 6 instances where only Jamison & Brereton (2014) translate *íd* as an intensifier is the following stanza dedicated to the sacrificial horse:

(458) <i>eśá</i>	<i>chāgaḥ</i>	<i>puró</i>	<i>ásvena</i>
DEM:NOM.SG.M	goat:NOM.SG.M	LP	horse:INS.SG.M
<i>vājínā</i>	/	<i>pūṣṇó</i>	<i>bhāgó</i>
prizewinning:INS.SG.M		Pūṣan:GEN.SG.M	portion:NOM.SG.M
<i>nīyate</i>	<i>viśvádeviyah</i>	/	<i>abhipríyam</i> <i>yát</i>
lead:PASS.3SG	of.all.gods:NOM.SG.M		pleasing:ACC.SG.M when
<i>puroḷásam</i>	<i>árvatā</i>	/	<i>tváṣṭéd</i> [= <i>tváṣṭā id</i>]
fore.offering:ACC.SG.M	steed:INS.SG.M		Tvaṣṭar:NOM.SG.M+PRT

<i>enam</i>	<i>sauśravasāya</i>	<i>jinvati</i>
DEM:ACC.SG.M	good.fame:DAT.SG.N	stimulate:3SG

‘This billy-goat, belonging to all the gods, is led in front, along with the prizewinning horse, as Pūšan’s portion. When (they lead the goat) as the pleasing fore-offering along with the steed, **it is** Tvaṣṭar **himself who** stimulates him for (the deed) that brings good fame.’ RV 1.162.3

Jamison & Brereton (2014: 344) appear to render the function of *íd* not only by an intensifier but also by a cleft construction. In order to understand the function of *íd*, it is first necessary to discuss why the god Tvaṣṭar occurs in this stanza. Geldner (1951–1957: I, 222) and Witzel & Gotō (2007: 726) remark that he is known for creating animals or other beings.⁴⁵² However, Jamison (comm.I.2: ad loc.) sees “a tighter connection”. She observes that Tvaṣṭar occurs in all hymns that are recited during the animal sacrifice. Moreover, he even “has a defined role in the animal sacrifice, and that role, somewhat paradoxically, involves both giving life and setting the stage for taking it away by sacrifice”. The fact that Tvaṣṭar is an important character in the context of the animal sacrifice justifies the interpretation of *íd* as an intensifier, because he is more significant than other entities involved (factor b.). In addition, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 344) use a cleft construction so that they appear to assume that an additional contrast between Tvaṣṭar and other participants of the sacrifice is expressed, which is compatible with the exhaustive function of *íd*. By this the significance of Tvaṣṭar in the given context is enhanced: Not just someone involved in the situation stimulates him, but Tvaṣṭar himself does so. I am not certain whether *íd* really fulfills such a double function in this passage but I believe that it does mark Tvaṣṭar as significant and therefore I consider an interpretation as an intensifier to be justifiable. Yet, the origin of this interpretation might be its function of marking exhaustive focus. With respect to the following passage I believe that the interpretation as an intensifier is the most plausible but nevertheless, contrast appears to be involved:

(459) <i>kratuprāvā</i>		<i>jaritā</i>		<i>śásvatām</i>
fulfilling.conception:NOM.SG.M		singer:NOM.SG.M		perpetual:GEN.PL.M
<i>áva</i>	/	<i>índra</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>bhadrá</i>
help:NOM.SG.N		Indra:NOM.SG.M	PRT	auspicious:NOM.SG.F
<i>prámatiḥ</i>		<i>sutávatām</i>		
providence:NOM.SG.F		with.pressed.soma:GEN.PL.M		

‘The singer bringing to fulfillment his conception is a help for each and every one; Indra **himself** is auspicious solicitude for those who have pressed the soma’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1559)

⁴⁵² Witzel & Gotō (2007: 289) render *íd* as a modal particle: ‘Wenn (sie) die sehr liebe Vorspende mit dem Renner (führen), erquickt ja Tvaṣṭar diese zur Rühmlichkeit’.

‘... (But) Indra **alone** is the good providence of those who have pressed (the soma)’⁴⁵³
RV 10.100.11ab

Following Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1558) this passage describes “[t]he happy conclusion of the sacrifice”. I assume that the two pādas each have multiple foci, i.e. the subjects are contrasted with each other and the genitive objects are contrasted with each other. The two pādas can thus be paraphrased as ‘THE SINGER supports EVERYONE; INDRA supports THE SOMA-PRESSERS’. The function of *íd*, which occurs after the second subject, is therefore comparable to that seen in ex. (364) of Section 5.1. Notice that there is also a difference in rank between the contrasted elements. The referent of genitive of pāda b, the soma-pressers, has a higher rank than the referent of the genitive in pāda a, viz. everyone (else). Likewise, the subject of pāda b, Indra, has a higher rank than the subject of pāda a, the singer. Indra’s rank is particularly high because he is the ruler of gods and mortals (Hillebrandt 1902: 168). This evokes the reading of *íd* as an intensifier. It is not one of his subjects that supports the soma-presser, i.e. perhaps another god, a mighty being, but it is Indra himself, who is even mightier. It seems that in this passage, Indra and the singer are contrastive topics. Renou (1955–1969: V, 64) has a different interpretation of *íd*. Like I do, he sees a contrast between the two pādas, because he supplies the adversative conjunction ‘But’ (‘Mais’) in the beginning of pāda b.⁴⁵⁴ However, unlike Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1559), he translates *íd* as a scalar exclusive particle. If I understand it correctly, he assumes pāda b to express a sufficient condition so that the scale evoked by *íd* is reversed. This means that nobody with less power than Indra can be the good providence for the soma-pressers. However, as I have mentioned above, I follow the general view by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1558) that this passage describes “[t]he happy conclusion of the sacrifice”. Given that this is correct, I find their (2014: 1559) interpretation of *íd* as an intensifier more plausible. For then it enhances the fact that the soma-pressers will be rewarded by the help of the mightiest being in the world. In contrast, if *íd* were to be interpreted as an exclusive particle, pāda b would receive an admonitory character, which would be at odds with the positive nature that Jamison & Brereton assign to the stanza.

Even though in these cases I find the interpretation of *íd* as an intensifier plausible, the interpretation of the remaining 4 passages where Jamison & Brereton (2014) translate *íd* as an intensifier is more problematic. Consider the following passage:

⁴⁵³ The translation follows Renou (1955–1969: V, 64): ‘Le chantre qui emplit (sa) capacité-d’inspiration est l’auxiliaire de tous (les hommes) qui se succèdent. (Mais) Indra seul est l’heureuse providence de ceux qui ont pressé (le soma)’.

⁴⁵⁴ Ludwig (1876–1888: I, 265) also connects the two pādas with the adversative conjunction ‘but’ (‘aber’): ‘den geist erfüllt der lobsänger; gegenstand der liebe aller ist er; Indra aber ist für die, die soma haben, die gütige vorsehung’. Notice, however that his translation of pāda a is not in accordance with the interpretation that I endorse here.

(460) <i>vīlāú</i>	<i>satīr</i>	<i>abhí</i>	<i>dhīrā</i>
stronghold:LOC.SG.N	be:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.PL.F	LP	wise:NOM.PL.M
<i>atr̥ndan</i>	/	<i>prācāhinvan</i>	<i>mānasā</i>
pierce:IPRF.3PL		forward:INS.SG.N+impel:IPRF.3PL	mind:INS.SG.N
<i>saptá</i>	<i>vīprāḥ</i>	/	<i>viśvām</i>
seven	inspired:NOM.PL.M	all:ACC.SG.F	find:IPRF.3PL
<i>pathiyām</i>	<i>ṛtāsya</i>	/	<i>prajānānn</i>
path:ACC.SG.F	truth:GEN.SG.N	LP.know:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.M	<i>ít</i>
<i>tá</i>	<i>nāmasā</i>	<i>viveśa</i>	
DEM:ACC.PL.F	mind:INS.SG.N	enter:PERF.3SG	

‘The insightful ones bored through to the (cows), though they were in a stronghold. The seven inspired poets impelled (the cows?) with advancing mind. They found the whole path of truth. **Himself** knowing (the way), he [=Indra] entered among them [=cows] with homage.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 509)⁴⁵⁵

‘(Since then) the knowing one has taken these with his homage.’⁴⁵⁶ RV 3.31.5

Regarding pāda d, there are several unclarities. The subject is probably Indra, although Geldner (1907–1909: II, 50) contemplates Saramā, Indra’s dog. More problematic is the object. The form *tá* might be a neuter plural (e.g. Oldenberg 1909–1912: I, 241) or a sandhi form of *tās* and thus a feminine plural (e.g. Jamison comm.III: ad loc.). In either interpretation, the exact referent is not entirely clear. What is also not clear is the syntactic function of the participle *prajānān* ‘knowing’, which precedes *íd*. Geldner (1951–1957: I, 367) interprets it as the subject, whereas Jamison & Brereton (2014: 509) interpret it as a secondary predicate. The latter interpretation provides the context for an intensifying use of *íd*, more specifically an adverbial use. The first question is then whether this is an adverbial-inclusive or an adverbial exclusive use, which are exemplified by the b. and c. sentence in ex. (452), respectively. Following König & Gast (2006: 225), in the former use “the intensifier can roughly be paraphrased by *alone*, *without help*, or *on one’s own*; in the inclusive use additive particles like *also*, *too*, or *as well* provide more suitable paraphrases”. Jamison (comm.III: ad loc.) explains that she assumes the implicit object of *prajānān* to be coreferential with *pathiyām* ‘the way’ in the previous pāda. This means that in her interpretation Indra knows the way in addition to the cows, which suggests an adverbial-inclusive reading. Notice, however, that this analysis is only applicable under the premise that the general interpretation of this passage by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 509), which is but one among several others, is correct. Moreover, even if it is correct, another interpretation of *íd* is possible as well. In Section 5.7, I will argue that *íd* after secondary

⁴⁵⁵ Following the emendation by Jamison (comm.III: ad loc.), I put ‘the way’ in pāda d in brackets.

⁴⁵⁶ The translation follows Geldner (1951–1957: I, 367): ‘Der Kundige hat (seitdem) mit seiner Anbetung diese eingeschlagen’.

predicates functions as an emphasizer, i.e. it emphasizes that the secondary predicate holds true for the controller. This may well be the case in this passage as well (cf. Geldner 1907–1909: I, 27). Thus, since it remains unclear whether *íd* can function as an adverbial-exclusive intensifier, it would be futile to discuss the semantic properties of these elements in more detail. In RV 7.18.6 and 8.45.3, too, an interpretation of *íd* as an emphasizer after the predicate or secondary predicate, respectively, is possible.⁴⁵⁷ Another of these passages is the unclear ex. (559) in Section 5.9. In this example, I do not agree with Jamison & Brereton’s translation of *íd*.

In this section, I have attempted to show that *íd* can be assigned the function of an adnominal intensifier. This assumption is corroborated by a parallel behavior of the particles *hii* and *eva* in Hindi and Classical Sanskrit, respectively. By means of ex. (455), I have argued that it is plausible to assume such a function for *íd* as well. The use of *íd* as an intensifier becomes especially clear in ex. (457). Ex. (458) suggests that *íd* possesses the ability to evoke both a contrastive and an intensifying reading and in ex. (459), intensifying *íd* appears to occur with a contrastive topic. I have not identified certain cases of *íd* as an adverbial-inclusive or adverbial-exclusive use.

5.6 *íd* as an additive particle and a particularizer

In this section, I will discuss two functions of *íd* that are in some passages assumed by the translators but which appear to be only marginal or even non-existent. These are the functions of an additive particle and a particularizer. From a typological perspective it is justifiable that a particle with exclusive function like *íd* can have additive and particularizing function as well. Ricca (2017) shows that Old Italian *pur(e)* can have both exclusive and additive function, although there as well the additive one is quite rare. Goldstein (2019) shows that the Greek particle $\gamma\epsilon$ functions both as an exclusive particle and as a particularizer.⁴⁵⁸ Yet, in examples in which Rigvedic *íd* has been assumed to have one of these two functions, I will show that a different interpretation is possible.

⁴⁵⁷ Gast & Siemund (2006: 350f.) remark that adverbial-inclusive intensifiers are uncommon from a typological point of view.

⁴⁵⁸ He labels the function that can be translated as ‘especially’ as SUPERLATIVE MODIFIER. He uses the term PARTICULARIZER for those instances that can be translated as ‘in fact’ or ‘specifically’.

5.6.1 *íd* as an additive particle

In Section 5.4, I discussed the similarities between Rigvedic *íd* and the enclitic *ɔut* in the Central Salish language ʔayʔajuθəm. Both operators have an exclusive function but when they occur after universal quantifiers they function as a slack regulator. A further characteristic of *ɔut* is that in addition to functioning as an exclusive operator it may also be additive, as the following example shows:

(461) *Your friend goes shopping and she gets everything on her list and even flowers which are not on her list. She even got eggs, which she normally forgets.*

<i>ɔuwkʷ</i>	<i>tam</i>	<i>yix-at-as</i>	<i>miyə=ɔut</i>	<i>qʷasəm</i>	<i>yəq-t-as</i>
all	thing	remember-CTR-3ERG	also=EXCL	flowers	buy-CTR-3ERG
<i>higa</i>	<i>kʷ</i>	<i>χʷaχʷit</i>	<i>(yəq-t-əs)</i>		
CONJ	DET	eggs	(buy-CTR-3ERG)		

‘She remembered everything and she **even** bought flowers and eggs.’ (Huijsmans 2019: 14)

Notice, however, that *ɔut* co-occurs with the additive operator *miyə* in this example. Nevertheless, this might be another parallel between the two operators *ɔut* and *íd*, because *íd* is sometimes considered to have additive function as well (Böhtlingk & Roth 1855–1875: I, 793; Grassmann 1873: 205f.). However, the additive use appears to be only marginally attested in the Rigveda and when there are potentially additive contexts, the translators disagree with respect to its translation.⁴⁵⁹ One of the cases in which an additive interpretation appears most likely at first sight is the following passage, which is dedicated to the fire god Agni:

(462) *vājintamāya sāhyase supitriya / tṛṣú cyāvāno ánu jātávedase //*

<i>anudré</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>yó</i>	<i>dhr̥ṣatá</i>
waterless:LOC.SG.N	PRT	REL:NOM.SG.M	be.bold:PTCP.PRS.ACT.INS.SG.N
<i>váram</i>	<i>saté</i>		<i>/ mahíntamāya</i>
select:ACC.SG.N	be:PTCP.PRS.ACT.DAT.SG.M		great:SUP.DAT.SG.M
<i>dhánvanéd [= dhánvanā íd]</i>	<i>aviṣyaté</i>		
wasteland:INS.SG.N+PRT	be.greedy:PTCP.PRS.ACT.DAT.SG.M		

‘O you of good ancestry, to the best prizewinner, the mightier one, to Jātavedas (does) the (flame?) stirring thirstily con(cede), to him who acts boldly when he is by choice even in a waterless place, to the greatest one, the one who seeks greedily for food **even** through a wasteland.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1584)

‘... he one who seeks greedily for food through a wasteland **of all places**.’ (my adaptation) RV 10.115.6

The scope of *íd* in this example is the participle phrase *dhánvanā aviṣyaté* ‘to the one who seeks greedily for food through a wasteland’. As it is unlikely that fire finds food in the wasteland, it

⁴⁵⁹ In several instances, Jamison & Brereton (2014) translate *íd* as ‘even’ when it occurs after a comparative. In these cases, I assign *íd* the function described in Section 5.7.

is justifiable to regard *íd* as a scalar additive particle like Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1584).⁴⁶⁰ Geldner (1951–1957: III, 340) interprets *íd* as an exclusive particle and renders it as German ‘nur’.⁴⁶¹ However, this interpretation does not seem to be appropriate in the given context. For wastelands are not the only places where fire seeks for food, i.e. consumes combustible materials. Even though Geldner explains that fire is found particularly in arid environments, fire is not completely restricted to these areas, so that an exclusive interpretation of *íd* is not justified. Interestingly, pāda c contains an expression that is similar to *dhánvanā íd*, namely *anudré* ‘in a waterless (place)’, which is followed by the scalar additive particle *cid*. This raises the question of what the exact difference would be between the primarily additive particle *cid* and the apparent additive use of *íd*. Geldner sees a close relationship between these two expressions and assumes that they support each other (“stützen sich gegenseitig”) (cf. Jamison comm.X.3: ad loc.).⁴⁶² Ludwig (1876–1888: I, 469) renders *cid* as the scalar additive particle ‘selbst’ and *íd* as the general additive operator ‘auch’ but that does not allow for a conclusion where he sees the difference between them.⁴⁶³ Renou (1955–1969: XIV, 27) leaves *cid* untranslated and renders *íd* as an intensifier ‘itself’ (‘même’).⁴⁶⁴ In contrast, Griffith (1896–1897: II, 560), renders *cid* as ‘even’ and leaves *íd* untranslated: ‘Who surely gives a boon even in thirsty land, most powerful, prepared to aid us in the wilds’. Curiously, Velankar (1959: 11) leaves *cid* untranslated and renders *íd* as ‘even’: ‘whether you boldly spread yourself at will on a waterless desert, or whether you, the greatest one, feel greedy for even a dry plain’. In my opinion, it is most plausible to assign *íd* the function of an identifier. There clearly is a “dissonance of conflict” (König 1986: 60) between what is said in pāda d and the implicit assumption that one does not find food in a wasteland. I propose that *íd* is used to emphasize the identity of *dhánvanā* and the same referent in this implicit proposition. Thus, *dhánvanā íd* is comparable to German *ausgerechnet in einer Wüste* ‘in a wasteland of all places’.

I will now go on to discuss further cases in which *íd* is allegedly additive. For reasons of space, I will not discuss all passages where some translation appears to interpret *íd* as additive but I will restrict myself to those four cases which Grassmann (1873: 205f.) gives in his dictionary as well as a group of passages that resembles ex. (461) from ?ay?ajuθəm above. In

⁴⁶⁰ See also Grassmann (1876–1877: II, 393): ‘Der kühnlich auch in dürrem Lande Heil verschafft, dem allgewalt’gen, der in Wüsten auch erquickt’.

⁴⁶¹ ‘wenn er dreist selbst auf wasserlosem Boden mit Vorliebe weilt, dem gar Gewaltigen, wenn er nur auf dürrem Lande Nahrung sucht’.

⁴⁶² Velankar (1959: 11) actually considers them to be contrasted.

⁴⁶³ ‘der selbst in waszerlosem lande zuversichtlich das beste, [bemächtige dich] des grosartigsten, der auch in der wüste zu helfen bereit’.

⁴⁶⁴ ‘(il rend hommage à toi) qui (te poses) à ton gré sur (un sol) sans eau, (agissant) hardiment, (dieu) très puissant qui cherches un aliment dans le désert même’.

all the cases that Grassmann gives, it is unproblematic to assign *íd* one of the other functions that I have described or will describe in the other sections, as in the following example from a hymn to Dawn:

(463) <i>sadr̥śīr</i>		<i>adyá</i>		<i>sadr̥śīr</i>
with.same.appearance:NOM.PL.F		today		with.same.appearance:NOM.PL.F
<i>íd</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>śvó</i>	/	<i>dīrghám</i>
PRT	PRT	tomorrow		long:ACC.SG.N
<i>váruṇasya</i>		<i>dhāma</i>		<i>sacante</i>
Varuṇa:GEN.SG.M		law:ACC.SG.N		follow:MID.3PL

‘Of the same appearance today, **just** the same appearance also tomorrow, they follow the long(-standing) ordinance of Varuṇa.’ RV 1.123.8ab

Following Jamison & Brereton (2014: 286), this and the following stanza describe “the identity and diversity of the dawns of each individual day”. For *íd* to have additive function, one would have to assume that it is associated with the following word.⁴⁶⁵ However, it is equally possible to construe *íd*, as usual, with the preceding word, viz. *sadr̥śīr* ‘of the same appearance’. I assume that it emphasizes the identity of the appearance and thereby functions as a slack regulator. This is also reflected in the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 286). That their translation also contains the additive ‘also’ is possibly due to the presence of *u*, which according to Klein (1978b: 138) has a conjunctive function in this passage.

The second example that Grassmann gives, RV 1.147.3, is identical to ex. (493) in Section 5.7, where I interpret *íd* as an emphasizer. Consider now the following passage:

(464) <i>indrāviṣṇū</i>		<i>sutapá</i>		<i>vām</i>
Indra.Viṣṇu:VOC.DU.M		soma.drinker:ACC.DU.M		2DU.ACC
<i>uruṣyati</i>	/	<i>yā</i>		<i>mártiyāya</i>
make.space:3SG		REL:NOM.DU.M		mortal:DAT.SG.M
<i>pratidhīyámānam</i>		<i>ít</i>	/	<i>kṛśānor</i>
LP.put:PTCP.PRS.PASS.ACC.SG.N		PRT		Kṛśānu:GEN.SG.M
				<i>ástur</i>
				shooter:GEN.SG.M
<i>asanām</i>		<i>uruṣyáthaḥ</i>		
shot:ACC.SG.F		make.space:2DU		

‘it makes wide space for you two soma-drinkers, o Indra and Viṣṇu, who cause (the arrow) to go wide **just** as it is being aimed at the mortal, the shot of the shooter Kṛśānu.’ RV 1.155.2b–d

A problem regarding the analysis of *íd* is the morphological form of the preceding participle *pratidhīyámānam* ‘being aimed’. Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 151) apparently assumes that it constitutes a nominal expression with the feminine *asanām* ‘shot’, but he considers the former to be masculine for metrical reasons. Renou (1955–1969: XV, 36) regards it as a neuter,

⁴⁶⁵ Cf. the translation by Grassmann (1876–1877: II, 127): ‘An Aussehn heute gleich und gleich auch morgen, befolgen sie Varuna’s ew’ge Satzung’.

possibly because it anticipates a following neuter or because the neuter noun *śáryam* ‘arrow’ is to be supplied. As the translation in the example shows, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 332) opt for the latter possibility. They interpret *mártiyāya pratidhīyāmānam* ‘being aimed at the mortal’ as a complex secondary predicate and ‘the arrow’ as its covert controller. Following this interpretation one can assume that *íd* is employed to emphasize the temporal overlap between the secondary and the matrix predicate or specify the marginal phase. In the latter case, one would have to assume that the beginning of the action of aiming is regarded as a temporal boundary. Then, the secondary predicate might be rendered as ‘as soon as it is aimed at the mortal’.⁴⁶⁶ In the last passage that Grassmann (1873: 205f.) gives, *íd* occurs after a conjunction:

(465) <i>yád</i>	<i>ín</i>	<i>nú</i>	<i>indra</i>		<i>pṛthivī</i>	
when	PRT	now	Indra:VOC.SG.M		earth:NOM.SG.F	
<i>dásabhujir</i>			/	<i>áhāni</i>	<i>viśvā</i>	<i>tatánanta</i>
with.ten.coils:NOM.SG.F				day:ACC.PL.N	all:ACC.PL.N	extend:PERF.SBJV.MID.3PL
<i>kṛṣṭáyah</i>		/	<i>átrāha</i> [= <i>átra áha</i>]		<i>te</i>	<i>maghavan</i>
people:NOM.PL.F			then+PRT		2SG.GEN	bountiful:VOC.SG.M
<i>viśrutam</i>			<i>sáho</i>	/	<i>diyām</i>	<i>ánu</i>
LP.hear:PPP.NOM.SG.N			strength:NOM.SG.N		heaven:ACC.SG.M	LP
<i>śávasā</i>			<i>barhānā</i>		<i>bhuvat</i>	
power:INS.SG.N			mightiness:INS.SG.F		become:AOR.INJ.3SG	

‘Now, o Indra, **just** as far as the earth with its ten coils (extends) and the separate peoples will extend throughout all the days, just to there, o bounteous one, your widely famed strength will pervade heaven with vast power and mightiness.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 167)

‘**As soon as** the earth assumed ten times its extent and the people extended all days, o Indra ...’⁴⁶⁷

‘**Even** if the earth were ten times vaster and the people had continually multiplied (on it), ...’ (Velankar 1948: 16) RV 1.52.11

Grassmann (1876–1877: II, 57) regards the subclause as a scalar concessive conditional clause (cf. Section 4.6.2.2).⁴⁶⁸ Even though Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 51) is not convinced of the irrealis interpretation in the translation by Grassmann (1876–1877: II, 57), Hettrich (1988: 373) regards it as a concessive conditional too, but he does not comment on the function of *íd*.⁴⁶⁹ A concessive conditional interpretation may be possible but it is not the only plausible

⁴⁶⁶ Apte (1957–1959: I, 501) gives the meaning ‘scarcely, the moment, as soon as’ for *eva* with participles in younger Sanskrit.

⁴⁶⁷ The translation follows Geldner (1951–1957: I, 67): ‘Sobald die Erde den zehnfachen Umfang annahm (und) die Völker alle Tage sich ausdehnten, o Indra, da kam fürwahr deine berühmte Macht, du Gabenreicher, dem Himmel an Stärke, an Selbstvertrauen gleich’.

⁴⁶⁸ ‘Wenn, Indra, auch die Erde zehnmal grösser wär’, und Tag für Tag die Völker sich verbreiteten, Dann würd’, o starker, deine weitberühmte Macht der Welt doch gleich an Kraft und Fülle sein’.

⁴⁶⁹ He translates: ‘Auch wenn sich die Erde und die Völker [in Zukunft] alle Tage ausdehnen sollten, wird deine Macht dem Himmel gleichkommen’.

interpretation. Geldner (1951–1957: I, 67) interprets the subclause as temporal. Since he renders the conjunction as ‘as soon as’ (‘sobald’), I assume that in his interpretation *íd* is used to specify the marginal phase (cf. Section 5.3). Witzel & Gotō (2007: 100) also interpret the subclause as temporal. According to their interpretation, *íd* emphasizes the identity of the time during which the events in the subclause happen and the time during which those in the main clause happen.⁴⁷⁰ Yet differently, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 167) interpret the adverb *átra* in the main clause, and apparently also the conjunction *yád* in the subordinate clause, as local. Following their interpretation, *íd* may be regarded as an identifier or as intensificatory.⁴⁷¹ As a result, the assumption that *íd* is a scalar additive particle and marks the subclause as a concessive conditional is not compelling.

Apart from the passages that Grassmann (1873: 205f.) gives, I will now investigate another context here, one that resembles the structure of ex. (461) from ʔayʔajuθəm. The Rigveda contains three passages in which *íd* follows the additive particle *caná*. This particle can be either negative (‘not even’) or positive (‘even’). For its use see exx. (60)–(62) in Section 4.1 and the references I have given there, and cf. also the discussion of ex. (97) in Section 4.2. The employment of *caná íd* can be seen in the following example:⁴⁷²

(466) <i>ná</i>	<i>sá</i>	<i>svó</i>	<i>dákṣo</i>	
NEG	DEM:NOM.SG.M	OWN:NOM.SG.M	devising:NOM.SG.M	
<i>varuṇa</i>		<i>dhrútiḥ</i>	<i>sá</i>	/ <i>súrā</i>
Varuṇa:VOC.SG.M		deception:NOM.SG.F	DEM:NOM.SG.F	liquor:NOM.SG.F
<i>manyúr</i>		<i>vibhídako</i>	<i>ácittiḥ</i>	/
frenzy:NOM.SG.M		dice:NOM.SG.M	thoughtlessness:NOM.SG.M	
<i>ásti</i>	<i>jyáyān</i>	<i>kánīyasa</i>	<i>upāré</i>	/
be:3SG	older:NOM.SG.M	younger:GEN.SG.M	misdeed:LOC.SG.M	
<i>svápnas</i>	<i>canéd [= caná ít]</i>	<i>ánrtasya</i>	<i>prayotá</i>	
sleep:NOM.SG.M	PRT+PRT	untruth:GEN.SG.N	expeller:NOM.SG.M	

‘This was not one’s own devising nor was it deception, o Varuṇa, (but rather) liquor, frenzy, dice, thoughtlessness. The elder exists within the misdeed of the younger. **Not even** sleep wards off untruth.’ RV 7.86.6

Channing (1889: cii) remarks that there is discord regarding the interpretation of *caná* in this passage. This discord does not only concern *caná* but also the following *íd*. Jamison & Brereton’s (2014: 992) translation ‘not even’, which I give in the example, does not make clear

⁴⁷⁰ ‘Gerade zu der Zeit, wenn die Erde von zehnfachem Umfang (sein wird), o Indra, (und) die Volksstämme sich alle Tage ausbreiten werden, da kommt ja deine berühmte Macht, o vermögender, dem Himmel an Gewalt, an Festigkeit gleich’.

⁴⁷¹ Notice also the presence of the particle *áha* in the main clause, which probably interacts with *íd* in a way that is yet to be determined. Hejib (1984: 324) assigns *aha* a temporal-causal meaning.

⁴⁷² The combination *caná íd* occurs also in RV 4.30.3 and 7.18.9.

what function they assign to *íd* or how this sequence differs from simple *caná*. Similar translations are given by Müller (1891: 267), Griffith (1896–1897: II, 82), Velankar (1963b: 190) and Dōyama & Gotō (2022: 270). Also Klein (1985b: 290f.) determines the value of *caná* in this passage as ‘not even’ but does not comment on the presence of *íd*. Geldner (1907–1909: II, 227) glosses *caná íd* as ‘auch nicht einmal’, so that he appears to assign both particles additive function. Otto (1948: 12) appears to translate *caná* as ‘not even’ (‘selbst ... nicht’) and *íd* as the discourse particle ‘ja’, but I do not assign this function to *íd* when it occurs after the subject of a clause.⁴⁷³ Bloomfield’s (1908: 125) translation involves an intensifier, no additive particle and positive polarity: ‘Nay, sleep itself provokes unrighteous actions’.⁴⁷⁴ This is rejected by Oldenberg (1909–1912: II, 60), whose translation is in accordance with the one by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 992). Renou (1955–1969: V, 70) translates the clause with negative polarity but also seems to regard *caná íd* to function together as an intensifier.⁴⁷⁵ Another translation that involves an intensifier is the one by Lanman (1912: 372f.): ‘Not even (**caná** 1) sleep itself (**íd**) excludes wrong’. As he indicates, he regards *íd* and *caná* to function independently.⁴⁷⁶ The different interpretations that I have adduced here show that the exact function of *cána íd* and especially the contribution that *íd* makes in this collocation is hardly determinable. I therefore leave the question regarding the function of *íd* in this and the other two passages where it follows *caná* (RV 4.30.3 and 7.18.9) unanswered.

Considering all passages that Grassmann (1873: 205f.) gives for the alleged additive function of *íd*, in none of them is an additive interpretation of *íd* to be preferred. In ex. (462), it seems at first sight that an additive interpretation is the most plausible. Nevertheless, this would raise the question of how *íd* may differ from *cid*, when the latter is nearby. Moreover, I have suggested another plausible interpretation, which is in accordance with another function of *íd*, namely that of an identifier. In ex. (463), not only is it unproblematic to interpret *íd* as a slack regulator but it is also more advantageous than the additive interpretation because it allows for construing it with the preceding word. Similarly, in ex. (464) *íd* can be interpreted as specificatory or as emphasizing the temporal overlap of the secondary and the matrix predicate. In ex. (465), several interpretations of the subclause are possible so that an additive interpretation of *íd* is not compelling either. Highly problematic is the interpretation of the collocation *caná íd* (ex. (466)). I have not been able to determine the role of *íd* in this collocation

⁴⁷³ ‘Selbst der Schlaf macht uns ja nicht sicher vor dem Unrechten’.

⁴⁷⁴ Cp. Grassmann’s (1876–1877: I, 367) ‘der Schlaf selbst ist der sünd’gen Thaten Anlass’ and Ludwig’s (1876–1888: I, 102): ‘aber auch schlaf [trächtigkeit] ist der schlechtigkeit urheber’.

⁴⁷⁵ ‘Le sommeil même n’est pas un entraveur du mal’.

⁴⁷⁶ For yet a different interpretation of the second hemistich see Bergaigne (1895: 82).

but this means that an additive function cannot be assumed with any certainty either. At any rate, also apart from the passages discussed here, I find no other passage in the Rigveda where the translators agree on an additive interpretation of *íd*. I therefore conclude that an additive value of *íd* is not present in the Rigveda, at least when it occurs alone.

5.6.2 *íd* as a particularizer

A further function that *íd* might share with *cid* is that of a particularizer. As I have discussed in Section 4.7, there is uncertainty whether *cid* has this function or not. As for *íd*, this function is even more uncertain. There are only 2 instances in which Jamison & Brereton (2014) translate *íd* as ‘especially’. Geldner (1951–1957) translates it 4 times as ‘erst recht’, which may be interpreted as a particularizer. Witzel & Gotō (2007) and Witzel et al. (2013) do not translate *íd* as a particularizer at all.⁴⁷⁷ The two passages in which Jamison & Brereton (2014) translate *íd* as a particularizer are the following. They occur in subsequent stanzas in a hymn dedicated to Indra and Agni:

(467) <i>yéna</i>	<i>dṛ̥l̥h̥á</i>	<i>samátsu</i>	<i>á</i>	/
REL:INS.SG.M	be.firm:PPP.ACC.PL.N	battle:LOC.PL.F	LP	
<i>vī́ú</i>	<i>cit</i>	<i>sāhiṣīmáhi</i>	/	<i>agnír</i>
firm:ACC.PL.N	PRT	win:AOR.OPT.MID.1PL		Agni:NOM.SG.M
<i>váneva [= vánā iva]</i>	<i>vā́ta</i>	<i>ín</i>		
tree:ACC.PL.N+like	wind:LOC.SG.M	PRT		

‘by which we might become victorious over the strongholds, even the firm ones, in the combats, as Agni (is victorious) over the woods **especially** when there is wind.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1109)

‘... like Agni (is victorious) over the woods **only** when there is wind.’ (my adaptation) RV 8.40.1c–e

(468) <i>nahí</i>	<i>vām̐</i>	<i>vavráyāmahé</i>	/	
NEG.for	2DU.ACC	stick.in.hole:MID.1PL		
<i>athéndram [= átha índram]</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>yajāmahe</i>	/	<i>śáviṣṭham</i>
then+Indra:ACC.SG.M	PRT	sacrifice:MID.1PL		strongest:ACC.SG.M
<i>nṛ̥nám̐</i>	<i>náram</i>			
man:GEN.PL.M	man:ACC.SG.M			

‘For we do not stick you two together in a hole. But we sacrifice to Indra **especially** as strongest man among men.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1109)

‘... But/for we **only** worship Indra as the strongest man among men.’ (my adaptation) RV 8.40.2a–c

⁴⁷⁷ The translation by Witzel & Gotō (2007) and Witzel et al. (2013) comprises only books 1–5.

At first sight, *íd* does not appear to have its regular exclusive or identifying sense in ex. (467). As a result, Ludwig (1876–1888: II, 375), Grassmann (1876–1877: 1, 457), Griffith (1896–1897: II, 181), Geldner (1951–1957: II, 353) and Renou (1955–1969: XIV, 57) leave it untranslated.⁴⁷⁸ In contrast, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1109) render it as ‘especially’. This translation is justified by the context because fire (Agni) spreads particularly fast (and thus consumes larger amounts of wood) when it is windy. However, I see another possibility, namely that *íd* functions as a scalar exclusive particle. This yields a translation of pāda e as ‘like Agni (is victorious) over the woods only when there is wind’. This interpretation is based on the same assumption as the one by Jamison & Brereton, namely that the fire is particularly strong in the wind. I assume that the poet expresses that he and his associates want to acquire great power. They want their power not only to be comparable to the usual power of fire, but to the power that fire has in the wind, and no less than that. Since this is a context that expresses a sufficient condition, the scale evoked by *íd* is reversed.

With respect to the first pāda of ex. (468), I follow the interpretation by Jamison (comm.VIII.1: ad loc.): “The idea is that, though the hymn is dedicated to both Indra and Agni, we don’t put the two gods in the same undifferentiated category”.⁴⁷⁹ Thus, as in the previous example, the context justifies translating *íd* as ‘especially’.⁴⁸⁰ Both Indra and Agni receive sacrifices but among the two, Indra has special properties. I must admit here, that I am not entirely sure about the interpretation of pādas b/c by Jamison & Brereton. Reading their translation, I intuitively assume that ‘especially’ is associated with ‘as the strongest man among men’ rather than with ‘to Indra’. In contrast, Jamison (comm.VIII.2: ad loc.) translates ‘But we sacrifice just (/especially) to Indra’ in her commentary, which suggests association with ‘to Indra. The Vedic syntax suggests that the latter option is preferable, as *íd* usually follows the word with which it is associated. However, as in the previous example, there is another possible interpretation. Geldner (1951–1957: II, 353) translates *íd* as the exclusive particle ‘nur’, so that according to him one can translate pādas b/c as ‘rather, we worship only Indra, the strongest

⁴⁷⁸ ‘durch den das feste in den schlachten, auch das starke wir besigen mögen wie feuer den wald bei winde’ (Ludwig); ‘Durch die im Kampf bezwingen wir, was fest und unbeweglich ist, wie Holz das Feuer windbewegt’ (Grassmann); ‘Whereby in fight we may o’ercome that which is strong and firmly fixed, as Agni burns the woods with wind’ (Griffith); ‘durch den wir in den Kämpfen das Wohlverschlossene, auch das Feste bezwingen können wie das Feuer im Sturmwind die Wälder’ (Geldner); ‘par laquelle nous puissions l’emporter dans les mêlées sur les places-fortes (de l’ennemi), si massives soient-elles, comme le feu dans le vent (l’emporte sur) les bois !’ (Renou).

⁴⁷⁹ Notice that the meaning of the verb *vavráyāmahé* is uncertain (see Oldenberg 1909–1912: II, 107, Geldner 1951–1957: II, 353, Renou 1955–1969: XIV, 128, Jamison comm.VIII.1: ad loc.).

⁴⁸⁰ Grassmann (1876–1877: 1, 457) also interprets *íd* as ‘vor allem’ (‘especially’): ‘vor allem ehren Indra wir, Den Mann, der Männer kräftigsten’.

man among men’.⁴⁸¹ This interpretation appears somewhat strange, because the exclusive function of *íd* expresses that Agni, albeit an important deity in Vedic mythology, is not worshiped at all. Therefore, Geldner’s interpretation appears to be disadvantageous relative to that of Jamison & Brereton. The exclusive interpretation becomes, however, very plausible if *śáviṣṭham nṛṇām náram* ‘the strongest man among men’ is not interpreted as an apposition of *índram* but predicatively. In Vedic mythology, the property of being the strongest among men is specifically attributed to Indra (Oldenberg 1894: 174). In contrast, Agni has other characteristics, for instance being the Hotar, i.e. the priest (cf. Oldenberg 1894: 129). Therefore, it is not surprising that among these two deities, it is only Indra who is worshiped as the strongest among men. Consequently, I suggest as a translation for pādas b/c of ex. (468) ‘But we only worship Indra as the strongest man among men’. The sense of the whole example can be paraphrased in the following manner: ‘Indra and Agni are different characters: we worship Indra as the strongest among men whereas we worship Agni as the Hotar (vel sim.)’. If this interpretation is correct, pādas b/c exhibit multiple foci, the first being *índram*, the focus of *íd*, and the second being *śáviṣṭham nṛṇām náram*, without an overt focus operator. Judging from Jamison’s alternative translation of pāda b in her (comm.VIII.2: ad loc.) commentary, I assume that Jamison & Brereton also consider this as a possible interpretation. For there, she renders *íd* as ‘just (/especially)’ and therefore assumes (and even prefers?) an exclusive interpretation of *íd*. Since her alternative translation does not comprise pāda c, it is, however, unclear whether she follows Geldner or endorses an interpretation similar to mine. With respect to the function of *íd*, one might wonder whether it is really used as a proper exclusive particle here or whether it marks exhaustive focus and should be rendered by a cleft-sentence: ‘But it is Indra whom we worship as the strongest man among men’. In my opinion, both interpretations are possible in this example. Notice furthermore, that one might translate the connective *átha* as a causal rather than an adversative conjunction, because pādas b/c can also be considered as an explanation of pāda a.

One of the passages in which Geldner (1951–1957) translates *íd* as ‘erst recht’ is RV 8.12.17.⁴⁸² There, it is unproblematic to interpret *íd* as exclusive or marking exhaustive focus (cf. Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1052) so that I will not discuss this passage here explicitly. In the three remaining passages, *íd* follows the adverb *evá*:

(469) <i>yé</i>	<i>vām</i>	<i>dámsāmsi</i>	<i>aśvinā</i>	/
REL:NOM.PL.M	2DU.GEN	wondrous.power:ACC.PL.N	Aśvin:VOC.DU.M	

⁴⁸¹ ‘vielmehr verehren wir nur den Indra, den stärksten Mann unter den Männern’.

⁴⁸² Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 411) appears to interpret it in a similar way and translates it as ‘vor allen’.

vīprāsaḥ *parimāmrśūḥ* / *evét [= evá íd]*
 inspired:NOM.PL.M LP.touch:PERF.3PL SO+PRT

kāṇvásyā *bodhatam*
 son.of.Kaṇva:GEN.SG.M be.aware:AOR.IMP.2DU

‘(There are) inspired poets who have fondled your wondrous powers all over, o Aśvins—**even** so, take note **only** of the son of Kaṇva.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1047)

‘So oft auch die Redekundigen sich mit euren Meisterstücken befaßt haben, o Aśvin, so achtet **erst recht** des Kaṇvasohnes!’ (Geldner 1951–1957: II, 304) RV 8.9.3

Even though Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1047) and Geldner (1951–1957: II, 304) assign different functions to *íd*, they both seem to regard *kāṇvásyā* ‘the son of Kaṇva as its focus’. I do not endorse such a solution. Instead, I assume that this example is comparable to ex. (383) in Section 5.2. This means that *íd* is associated with *evá* ‘so’, whose referent is the previous clause, and that it functions as an identifier. Thereby, it conveys that there is a conflict between the first hemistich and pāda c. The poet asks the Aśvins to regard the son of Kaṇva even though there are other inspired poets whom they might regard. Such a conflict is also expressed by ‘even so’ in Jamison & Brereton’s translation.⁴⁸³ In RV 8.10.2, *evá íd* occurs in the main clause within an alternative concessive conditional construction. This main clause is a repetition of pāda c in ex. (469), so that I consider *íd* to have the same function. The last case is the following:

(470) *yád* *vāṃ* *kakṣīvāṃ* *utá* *yád* *víaśva* /
 when 2DU.ACC Kakṣīvant:NOM.SG.M and when Vyaśva:NOM.SG.M

ṛṣir *yád* *vāṃ* *dīrghátamā* *juhāva* /
 seer:NOM.SG.M when 2DU.ACC Dīrghatamas:NOM.SG.M call:PERF.3SG

pr̥thī *yád* *vāṃ* *vainiyáḥ* *sādaneṣu* /
 Pṛthi:NOM.SG.M when 2DU.ACC Vainya:NOM.SG.M seat:LOC.PL.N

evéd [= evá íd] *áto* *aśvinā* *cetayethām*
 so+PRT of.this Aśvin:VOC.DU.M perceive:IMP.2DU

‘As when Kakṣīvat (called) you, as when Vyaśva, as when the seer Dīrghatamas called you, as when Pṛthi Vainya (called) you to the ritual seats, **even** so, take cognizance **just** of this.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1047)

‘Da euch Kaksīvat und da der Ṛṣi Vyaśva, da euch Dīrghatamas und da euch Pṛthī Vainya an den (Opfer)sitzen angerufen hat, so werdet darum **erst recht** (auf mich) aufmerksam, o Aśvin!’ (Geldner 1951–1957: II, 305) RV 8.9.10

With Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1047) I assume that the main clause is compared to the subclauses. The poet wants the Aśvins to heed his calls as they did when the people mentioned in the subclauses called them. As in ex. (469), I believe that *íd* is associated with *éva* and that

⁴⁸³ Perhaps Jamison & Brereton consider *íd* to have a double function, but this does not become clear from their translation.

it functions as an identifier. However, in contrast to ex. (469), I believe that ex. (470) does not involve an implicature of conflict between propositions.⁴⁸⁴ As a result, I do not assume a particularizing function of *íd* here either, nor do I assume it to be associated with a word that follows it.

In addition to the passages discussed above, where the translations suggest that *íd* might be a particularizer, I would like to discuss a further passage. In her analysis of Vedic particles, Lühr (2017: 286, 2018b: 184) assigns *íd* the meaning ‘especially’ in the following passage:

(471) <i>prá</i>	<i>tám</i>	<i>indra</i>	<i>naśīmahi</i>	/		
LP	DEM:ACC.SG.M	Indra:VOC.SG.M	reach:AOR.OPT.MID.1PL			
<i>rayīm</i>		<i>gómantam</i>	<i>ásvīnam</i>	/	<i>prá</i>	
wealth:ACC.SG.M		of.cows:ACC.SG.M	of.horses:ACC.SG.M		LP	
<i>bráhma</i>		<i>pūrvácittaye</i>	//	<i>ahám</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>dhí</i>
formulation:ACC.SG.N		first.thought:DAT.SG.F		1SG.NOM	PRT	for
<i>pitúṣ</i>		<i>pári</i>	/	<i>medhām</i>	<i>ṛtásya</i>	
father:ABL.SG.M		LP		wisdom:ACC.SG.F	truth:GEN.SG.N	
<i>jagrábha</i>	/	<i>ahám</i>	<i>sūrya</i>			
grab:PERF.1SG		1SG.NOM	sun:NOM.SG.M			
<i>ivājani</i>						
like+be.born:AOR.MID.1SG						

‘9. Might we attain to this, Indra: to wealth in cows and horses, and to a sacred formulation to be first in your thought.

10. Because **it is just** I who have acquired the wisdom of truth from my father, I have been (re)born like the sun.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1038)

‘... For I, **especially**, have received knowledge of the truth from my father. ...’ (Lühr 2017: 286) RV 8.6.9–10

The exact function of *íd* in this passage is difficult to determine. Geldner (1951–1957: II, 295) marks emphasis on the first person pronoun, but it is unclear what the exact nature of this emphasis is.⁴⁸⁵ In stanza 9 the poet expresses the wish that he and his associates acquire wealth and be favored by Indra. Since the first clause of stanza 10 contains the particle *hí* ‘for’ I assume that the poet wants to give a reason why he and his associates deserve this. As a result, I furthermore assume that *íd* is employed to express a contrast between the poet and someone from another (possibly hostile) group of people. The translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1038) is even stronger because in addition to the cleft construction they also use the exclusive particle ‘just’, which means that the poet is the only one who has received the knowledge. This

⁴⁸⁴ Perhaps Jamison & Brereton use ‘even so’ in the archaic sense ‘just like this’ in this stanza and not with the concessive meaning that it usually has in modern-day English and that it apparently also has in their translation ex. (469).

⁴⁸⁵ ‘Denn ich habe vom Vater die Sehergabe der Wahrheit geerbt’.

interpretation is possible but it may also be that *íd* is used to convey that although other people have received the knowledge as well, the poet nevertheless stands out among them, which would then justify the translation by Lühr (2017: 286, 2018b: 184). A hint towards the correct interpretation is given by the structure of the hymn. For stanza 10 is the beginning of a unit of three stanzas in which “the poetic ‘I’ (presumably Vatsa) speaks of his poetic heritage” (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1037). Stanza 11 also begins with the word *ahám* ‘I’, but it is not followed by any particle. Stanza 12 is given below:

(472) <i>yé</i>	<i>tvám</i>	<i>indra</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>tuṣṭuvúr</i>	/
REL:NOM.PL.M	2SG.ACC	Indra:VOC.SG.M	NEG	praise:PERF.3PL	
<i>ṛṣayo</i>	<i>yé</i>	<i>ca</i>	<i>tuṣṭuvúḥ</i>	/	
seer:NOM.SG.M	REL:NOM.SG.M	and	praise:PERF.3PL		
<i>máméd [= máma íd]</i>	<i>vardhasva</i>	<i>súṣṭutaḥ</i>			
1SG.GEN+PRT	strengthen:IMP.MID.2SG	well.praised:NOM.SG.M			

‘Whatever Ṛṣis have praised you and not praised you, Indra, well praised grow strong only by my (praises)!’⁴⁸⁶ RV 8.6.12

Following the translation by Geldner (1951–1957: II, 295), I consider this stanza to be a universal concessive conditional which is not marked by *cid*. As I have discussed in Section 4.6.2.1, I assume the exclusive function of *íd* in the main clause to enhance the concessive relation between the main and the subordinate clause(s): All other Ṛṣis, i.e. seers, are unimportant; there is only one single Ṛṣi that matters. As a result, I consider this to be a fairly clear instance of exclusive *íd*.⁴⁸⁷ In my view, this observation influences the interpretation of *íd* in stanza 10. The first and the last pāda of this three-stanza unit begin with a form of the first person pronoun followed by *íd*. In the last pāda, *íd* is exclusive and the poet wants Indra to disregard all other Ṛṣis. I therefore conclude that also in the first stanza *íd* is exclusive and that the poet wants to make clear that he alone possesses the knowledge of truth and therefore he alone deserves the attention of Indra.

The examples discussed in this section are according to the translations the ones possessing the highest probability that *íd* functions as a particularizer. The above discussion has shown that in ex. (468) it is unproblematic to interpret *íd* as an exclusive particle or as marking exhaustive focus. Similarly, I have argued that for ex. (467) it is possible to assume an exclusive function and that this can also account for the unusual position of *íd*. In exx. (469) and (470), I interpret *íd* as an identifier. Grassmann (1876–1877) interprets *íd* in 5 further passages (RV

⁴⁸⁶ The translation follows Geldner (1951–1957: II, 295): ‘So viele Ṛṣi’s dich auch gepriesen haben und nicht gepriesen haben, Indra, nur an meinen (Liedern) erbaue dich schöngepriesen!’.

⁴⁸⁷ Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1039) do not translate this stanza as a universal concessive conditional: ‘(There are those) who have not praised you, Indra, and seers who have praised you, but grow strong just (by) my (praise), as one well praised’. Nonetheless, I prefer their interpretation of *íd* as exclusive here too.

1.114.4, 7.22.6, 7.28.1, 8.60.10, 8.71.2) as a particularizer,⁴⁸⁸ but in these passages it is also unproblematic to interpret it as an exclusive particle or as marking exhaustive focus. Also in ex. (471), where Lühr (2017: 286, 2018b: 184) translates *íd* as ‘especially’, I have argued that the context points to an exclusive reading. Accordingly, I do not consider *íd* to have the function of a particularizer in the Rigveda.

5.7 *íd* after nominal predicates and nominals in other functions

This section is concerned with text passages in which *íd* occurs after nominals but in which none of the functions that I have described in the previous sections can be assigned to it. I will attempt to determine the function *íd* has in these cases by comparing it with *just* in English and *eva* in Classical Sanskrit. I will argue that unlike *just*, *íd* cannot be regarded as an extreme-degree modifier but I will propose an analysis as an emphasizer, i.e. as emphasizing the truth of a predicate. As is the case with *eva*, this may lead to a reading of universal quantification.

The Rigveda exhibits several passages where *íd* occurs after property-denoting nominals that function as attributes or predicates. In the following example, which speaks about Agni, it follows the nominal predicate:

(473) <i>citrá</i>	<i>íc</i>	<i>chísos</i>	<i>táruṇasya</i>
brilliant:NOM.SG.M	PRT	child:GEN.SG.M	tender:GEN.SG.M
<i>vakṣátho</i>			
growth:NOM.SG.M			

‘Brilliant is the waxing of the tender babe’ RV 10.115.1a

Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1584) leave *íd* untranslated in this example so that one wonders what its function might be. Geldner (1951–1957: III, 339) renders *íd* as ‘gar’. According to this interpretation, *íd* would be a degree modifier comparable to *cid* (cf. Section 4.5). Grassmann (1873: 206) also observes such a degree modifying nature “nach Adjektiven der Art, wo es oft in den Begriff der Steigerung (*recht*) hinüberspielt”. In fact, a similar employment is also found for English *just*. Lee (1987: 393) gives the following example for what he describes as an emphatic use of this particle:

(474) *I had so much milk it was just incredible.*

In this example, *just* is used to enhance the meaning of *incredible*. König (1991: 123) explains that this reading of *just*, which is comparable to *simply*, is restricted to certain contexts. It “is only possible if the focus of *just* denotes an extreme value on some scale”. Accordingly,

⁴⁸⁸ In RV 1.114.4 and 8.60.10 he translates it as ‘especially’ (‘vor allem’) and in RV 7.22.6 and 7.28.1 he translates it as ‘before all (others)’ (‘vor allen’); in RV 8.71.2 he translates it as ‘zumal’.

Morzycki (2012: 569) subsumes *just* under the group of EXTREME DEGREE MODIFIERS. Such a reading is also possible for the Vedic ex. (473). As is the case for *just* in English, the reading of Vedic *íd* also appears to be context dependent, which corroborates the parallel analysis of *íd* and *just*. Compare the following examples of English *just* (König 1991: 123) and Vedic *íd* with the previous two examples:

(475) *He is just mediocre/average/normal . . .*

(476) <i>imé</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>indra</i>	<i>ródasī</i>	
DEM:NOM.DU.F	PRT	Indra:VOC.SG.M	world.halves:NOM.DU.F	
<i>apāré</i>	/	<i>yát</i>	<i>samgrbhñá</i>	<i>maghavan</i>
boundless:NOM.DU.F		when	LP.grab:SBJV.2SG	bounteous:VOC.SG.M
<i>kāśír</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>te</i>		
handful:NOM.SG.M	PRT	2SG.DAT		

‘Even these two world-halves without limits—when you grabbed them together, bounteous Indra, it was **just** a handful for you.’ RV 3.30.5cd

In ex. (474), where *incredible* is an extreme value on a scale, *just* functions as a degree modifier. In contrast, in ex. (475), where its focus does not denote such a value, it is interpreted as a scalar exclusive particle. Similarly, in the Vedic ex. (476) the nominal predicate *kāśír* ‘a handful’ constitutes a rather low value in the given context. Hence, unlike ex. (473) this is a typical case of the scalar exclusive function of *íd*, comparable to ex. (340) in Section 5.1.

In Vedic, it is generally fairly difficult to identify nominals expressing an extreme degree, because the tests that Morzycki (2012: 570–573) provides (possibility of occurrence with *absolutely*, with prosodic intensification, with comparatives and degree constructions; use within objections and hyperboles) are largely based on speakers’ intuition.⁴⁸⁹ The most promising criterion is that of gradability, but here as well the reason for absence of a comparative may simply be that it does not happen to appear in the corpus and not that it could not be formed in Rigvedic times. Beltrama (2018: 322) observes that ‘extreme degree’ *just* also occurs with superlatives. Likewise, Rigvedic *íd* can be found with superlatives, as the following example shows:

(477) <i>ká</i>	<i>asmai</i>	/	<i>devájuṣṭā</i>	<i>ucyate</i>
what:NOM.SG.F	DEM:DAT.SG.M		agreeable.to.gods:NOM.SG.F	speak:PASS.3SG
<i>bhāmīne</i>	<i>gīḥ</i>	/	<i>yó</i>	<i>mártiyeṣu</i>
shining:DAT.SG.M	praise:NOM.SG.F		REL:NOM.SG.M	mortal:LOC.PL.M
[...]/	<i>hótā</i>	<i>yájiṣṭha</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>kṛṇóti</i>
	Hotar:NOM.SG.M	worshipping:SUP.NOM.SG.M	PRT	do:3SG
<i>devān</i>				
god:ACC.PL.M				

⁴⁸⁹ See also Paradis (1997: 54–57) for tests that identify extreme adjectives.

In the ex. (480), *eva* occurs after the subject, in ex. (481) after the nominal predicate and in ex. (482) after the copula. Following Ganeri (1999: 102), Dharmakīrti explains the three sentences in the following manner:

[(480)] Being-an-archer is excluded from connection with anyone other than Pārtha.

[(481)] Being-an-archer is excluded from non-connection with Caitra.

[(482)] Being-blue is excluded from permanent non-connection with a lotus.

In fact, there is debate on how to interpret the analysis by Dharmakīrti. Hence, Ganeri (1999) not only discusses his own interpretation of Dharmakīrti but also compares the view by the philosophical school of Nyāya, and to the interpretations of Dharmakīrti by Kajiyama (1973) and Gillon & Hayes (1982). He (1999: 112) summarizes them, formalized in terms of set theory, in the following table, where S is the set of referents denoted by the subject and P is the set of referents having the property denoted by the predicate:⁴⁹²

	“S <i>eva</i> P”	“S P <i>eva</i> ”
Dharmakīrti	$P \subseteq S$	$S \cap P \neq \emptyset$
Nyāya	$P \subseteq S \ \& \ S \cap P \neq \emptyset$	$S \subseteq P \ \& \ S \cap P \neq \emptyset$
Kajiyāma	$S = P$	$S \subseteq P \ \& \ S \cap P \neq \emptyset$
Gillon-Hayes	$P \subseteq S$	$S \subseteq P$

Notice that there is also disagreement on the interpretation of *eva* after the subject. I will not discuss this matter any further and only discuss the second column “S P *eva*”, which is exemplified by ex. (481) above. According to his interpretation of Dharmakīrti, *eva* after the predicate expresses that the intersection of S and P has to contain at least one element. In contrast, according to the interpretation by Gillon & Hayes (1982) S has to be a subset of P. Following the interpretations by Kajiyama (1973) and the Nyāya school given in the remaining columns, both needs to be true, i.e. S must be a subset of P and the intersection of S and P must contain at least one element.⁴⁹³ Since I am not primarily concerned with Classical Sanskrit, I will not discuss how the respective scholars have reached their analysis. Instead, I will test whether one of them can be successfully applied to the Rigvedic data. In the Rigveda, it is difficult to find a context where the exact meaning of a clause in which *íd* follows the nominal predicate can be determined. One possible case is the following:

(483) *adhaspadā́* *íc* *caidiyáśya* *kr̥ṣṭáyáś* /
under.feet:NOM.PL.F PRT lord.of.Cedis:GEN.SG.M community:NOM.PL.F
carmamnā́ *abhíto* *jánāḥ*
tanner:NOM.PL.M all.around man:NOM.PL.M

⁴⁹² Ganeri writes $S \wedge P$ instead of $S \cap P \neq \emptyset$. The row that he labels “Dharmakīrti” represents his own interpretation.

⁴⁹³ S might be an empty set, so that $S \subseteq P \ \& \ S \cap P = \emptyset$ is possible in the analysis of Gillon & Hayes (1982).

‘beneath the feet of the lord of the Cedis are (**all**) the communities, the “hide-tanning” men all around.’ RV 8.5.38cd

Following Ganeri’s (1999) interpretation of Dharmakīrti, which is the first analysis that is given in the table, ex. (483) would be false if the intersection of the set of communities and the set of people under the feet of the lord of the Cedis equaled an empty set, i.e. if there were no communities that are under the lord of the Cedis’ feet. This means that for ex. (483) to be true, there needs to be at least some community that is under the lord of the Cedis’ feet. However, as made explicit in the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1037) and also by Griffith (1896–1897: II, 119),⁴⁹⁴ I assume that this example is supposed to express that ALL communities are under the lord of the Cedis’ feet. This is captured by the analysis corresponding to the one by Gillon & Hayes (1982), according to which the communities are a subset of the people that are under the lord of the Cedis’ feet.⁴⁹⁵ This means that ex. (483) would be false if there were one community that is not under the lord of the Cedis’ feet. Hence, I believe that the analysis of *eva* by Gillon & Hayes (1982) describes the function of *íd* in this passage more adequately than the one that Ganeri (1999) assigns to Dharmakīrti. As for *eva*, Gillon (1999) defends his and his colleague’s analysis. Such an analysis of ex. (483) is also applicable to ex. (479) above. I assume ex. (479) to express that all pressing stones are on their way. The problem that follows is to determine whether the subset relation alone describes the meaning of *P íd* or whether the second conjunct that Kajiyama (1973) assumes needs to be true as well. This would mean that for ex. (483) to be true there must be no community that is not under the lord of the Cedis’ feet and there must be at least one community that is under the lord of the Cedis’ feet. This may seem redundant at first sight, but notice that from a purely semantic point of view, the English sentence *All flowers in my garden are blue* is true if there are no flowers at all in my garden. Nonetheless, it would be highly unnatural to utter such a sentence and I am afraid that such a question cannot be answered by means of the Rigvedic data.

If my hypothesis is correct that *íd* following a nominal predicate/predicate noun is used to express that there is no element in the set denoted by the subject for which the predicate does not hold true is correct, the question remains, how this meaning is obtained, because *íd* occurs with the predicate and thus does not seem to function as a quantifier of the subject nominal expression. For *eva*, the answer is given in the English translation of Dharmakīrti’s analysis by Gillon (1999: 120): “The limiting particle [*eva*], when stated immediately after a qualifier

⁴⁹⁴ ‘At Caidya’s feet are all the people round about, all those who think upon the shield’.

⁴⁹⁵ In terms of predicate logic, Gillon & Hayes (1982: 200) formalize sentences of this type as $(\forall x) (Sx \rightarrow Px)$, i.e. by means of universal quantification. Like Gillon & Hayes (1982: 202) in their analysis of *eva* in later Sanskrit, I do not assume a difference in meaning that corresponds to the relative order of subject and predicate.

the presence of *íd* explicitly excludes the possibility that it is not. In other words, *íd* emphasizes the fact that the predicate holds true for the subject. This use of *íd* is comparable to one of the functions that Simon-Vandenberg (2008) observes for English *certainly* and *definitely*, for which she (2008: 1529) gives the following example:

(485) *He added: “It’s early days, but I **definitely** think we’re on to something.”*

Simon-Vandenberg (2008: 1529) explains that in this sentence *definitely* “reinforces the proposition” and therefore she classifies it as an EMPHASIZER (see also Quirk et al. 1985 [2008]: 583). This is also in accordance with the affirmative function that Monier-Williams (1899: 165) assigns to *íd* and the translation ‘indeed, really’ that RIVELEX (II, 157) gives. Similarly, Tichy (1995b: 331) observes that after a verbal predicate *íd* emphasizes the reality of the verbal action (“verleiht *íd* der Aussage Nachdruck, indem es die Realität der Verbalhandlung bekräftigt”). This also seems to match the function that I assume for *íd* after nominal predicates here. The emphatic nature of *íd* becomes particularly apparent in the following example:

(486) <i>asvī́</i> with.horse:NOM.SG.M	<i>rathī́</i> with.chariot:NOM.SG.M	<i>surūpá</i> with.lovely.form:NOM.SG.M	<i>íd</i> / PRT
<i>gómāñ</i> rich.in.cows:NOM.SG.M	<i>íd</i> PRT	<i>indra</i> Indra:VOC.SG.M	<i>te</i> 2SG.GEN
<i>sákhā</i> comrade:NOM.SG.M			

‘Your comrade, o Indra, **certainly** has a horse and chariot, is lovely in form and rich in cows.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1033)

‘Your comrade, o Indra, has a horse and chariot, is **definitely** lovely in form and **definitely** rich in cows.’ (my adaptation) RV 8.4.9ab

This clause contains four coordinated nominal predicates but only the third and fourth are followed by *íd*. That Indra’s comrade has a horse and chariot is not a remarkable fact because many other warriors own a horse and chariot too. In contrast, the fact that he is lovely and has many cows is a property of Indra’s comrade in particular and thus the poet emphasizes that these predicates hold true for him. If my analysis is correct, the following example emphasizes that the predicate holds true for the subject in a twofold manner, namely by *íd* and by explicitly stating that the utterance is true (see also Lühr 2009: 179):

(487) <i>satyám</i> true:ACC.SG.N	<i>itthā</i> so	<i>vṛṣéd</i> [= <i>vṛṣā íd</i>] bull:NOM.SG.M+PRT	<i>asi</i> / be:2SG
<i>vṛṣajūtir</i> with.bullish.speed:NOM.SG.M	<i>no</i> 1PL.DAT	<i>ávṛtaḥ</i> unobstructable:NOM.SG.M	

‘This is truly so: you **alone** are the bull for us, with the speed of a bull, unobstructable’
Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1097)

‘This is truly so: you are **definitely** the bull for us, with the speed of a bull, unobstructable’
(my adaptation) RV 8.33.10ab

Such an employment is paralleled by the Old Italian exclusive particle *pur(e)*, which can also be used as an emphasizer, as Ricca (2017: 61) shows by the following example:

(488) *Adunque è egli **pur** vero ch’egli è morta la mia speranza e ’l mio diletto?*

‘So is it **really** true that my hope and my pleasure is dead?’ (Tavola ritonda, first half 14th century)

I believe that an analysis of *íd* as an emphasizer not only holds for nominal predicates and predicate nouns but also for appositions, attributes and secondary predicates.⁴⁹⁷ Consider again ex. (477) above. There, I assume that *íd* emphasizes that the property expressed by the apposition *yájiṣṭhas* ‘the best sacrificer’ holds true for Agni. Consider also ex. (489), where *íd* occurs with a property-denoting nominal that is probably an attribute and ex. (490), where it occurs with a secondary predicate:

(489) <i>tásmā</i>	<i>āyuh</i>	<i>prajāvad</i>	<i>íd</i>	/
DEM:DAT.SG.M	lifetime:ACC.SG.N	with.offspring:ACC.SG.N	PRT	
<i>bādhe</i>	<i>arcanti</i>	<i>ójasā</i>		
thrust:INF.DAT.SG	sing:3PL	strength:INS.SG.N		

‘To him they chant, for him to thrust (to them) with his strength a (full) lifetime along with offspring.’ RV 1.132.5de

(490) <i>námasvanta</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>upavākám</i>	<i>īyuh</i>
with.adoration:NOM.PL.M	PRT	praise:ACC.SG.M	go:PERF.3PL

‘with adoration men approached to praise her.’ (Griffith 1896–1897: I, 220) RV 1.164.8d

In ex. (489) the chanters want their life to be truly full of children. In ex. (490), *íd* emphasizes the truth of the circumstance that the men were paying veneration when they approached. Notice, however, that the syntactic status of *námasvantas* is not entirely clear. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 355) regard it as the subject and assign *íd* its ordinary exclusive function: ‘Just those offering their reverence went to the (morning) invocation’.

A conspicuous feature of examples like these is that when the nominal followed by *íd* is gradable, these clauses allow the interpretation of *íd* as a degree modifier that marks a high degree of the nominal rather than emphasizing the truth of the clause. This is not surprising, for Simon-Vandenberg (2008: 1530) remarks that emphasizers are prone to develop into degree modifiers. As Bolinger (1972: 94) explains, “[e]mphasis on the truth of the whole dictum leads by an easy inductive leap to an emphasis on some part of it. The step to a degree intensification is then easy”. In contrast to the extreme-degree modification that I contemplated in the beginning of this section, this reading is not restricted to extreme-degree nominals. I am not

⁴⁹⁷ Cf. also Bajaj (2016: 147f.) on Hindi *hii*.

certain whether a such a grammaticalization process is also present for Vedic *íd*.⁴⁹⁸ English *certainly* can not only function as an emphazier but also as an epistemic marker, i.e. the marker of the speaker’s certainty (Simon-Vandenberg 2008: 1531f.). In Section 5.8, I will show cases where *íd* marks epistemic modality, viz. the certainty of the speaker, which becomes especially clear when it follows subjunctives. Such a reading of *íd* is also possible with predicative nominals. Consider ex. (478) above, which occurs in a praise of healing plants. In this example, the predicate is in the subjunctive. Although it is possible to interpret *íd* as an emphazier, the primary function of *íd* in the main clause may be to mark the speaker’s certainty that when the proposition of the subordinate clause comes true, the proposition of the main clause will come true as well. Interestingly, *íd* co-occurs with the particle *kíla* in ex. ex. (478), which I regard as an indirect evidential in the Rigveda (see Ickler 1976).⁴⁹⁹ I assume that *íd* is used to indicate that the speaker is certain with respect to the correctness of his inference.

Apart from the different syntactic functions of the nominals with which *íd* occurs, it is also interesting to notice the different types of nominals with which *íd* can occur. Among the nominals that function as predicates or predicate nouns are also agent nouns, which then denote a verbal action. The Rigveda contains passages in which such predicative agent nouns are followed by *íd*, for instance the following one:

(491) *índra* *tvám* *avitéd [= avitá íd]* *asi* /
 Indra:VOC.SG.M 2SG.NOM helper:NOM.SG.M+PRT be:2SG
itthá *stuvató* *adrivaḥ*
 so praise:PTCP.PRS.ACT.GEN.SG.M with.stone:VOC.SG.M

‘O Indra, it is **only** you who are the helper of him who praises just so, o master of the stones.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1055)

‘O Indra, you **definitely** are the helper of him who praises just so, o master of the stones.’ (my adaptation) RV 8.13.26ab

(492) *dusprāvíyo* *avahantéd [= avahantá íd]* *ávācaḥ*
 unfriendly:ACC.PL.M LP.hitter:NOM.SG.M+PRT downwards:ACC.PL.M

‘he strikes down, deep down, the ill-strivers.’ RV 4.25.6d

In ex. (491), Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1055) assume *tvám* ‘you’ to be the focus of *íd* and interpret the particle as exclusive. However, I prefer to construe *íd* with the immediately preceding word and I do so in ex. (492) as well. In both examples, I assume that the function of *íd* is the same as the one I assume for *íd* after other nominal predicates, namely that it

⁴⁹⁸ Regarding German expressions like *wirklich* ‘really’ van Os (1986: 128–131) argues that they are not to be classified as degree modifiers.

⁴⁹⁹ For further literature on this particle see Bodewitz (1991–1992: 430–435, 2009: 279f.).

emphasizes that the predicate holds true for Indra. Notice that in ex. (491) a copula is present whereas the agent noun in ex. (492) functions as a nominal predicate.

In addition to agent nouns, the function of *íd* to emphasize the truth can also be found with participles that denote a verbal action. This can be seen in the following example, where *íd* follows a concessive circumstantial secondary predicate:

(493) <i>dípsanta</i>		<i>íd</i>	<i>ripávo</i>	<i>náha</i>
damage:DES.PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.PL.M		PRT	false:NOM.PL.M	NEG+PRT
<i>debhuḥ</i>				
damage:PERF.3PL				

‘Though wishing to damage, the cheats did no damage at all.’ RV 4.4.13d

The concessive relation of the circumstantial *dípsantas* ‘wishing to damage’ and *ná aha debhuḥ* ‘they did not damage at all’ is not marked explicitly with *cid* (see Section 4.6.2.3) and according to Lowe (2015: 179), this is rather exceptional for participles, for he usually observes only *sánt-* ‘being’ exhibiting a concessive relation to the main predicate. Nevertheless, this relation clearly exists, which also by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 565) assume in their translation. Notice also the presence of the particle *aha* after the negation, which is used here to mark contrast and thereby enhances the concessive relation (Hejib 1984: 93f.). Although I assume that the function of *íd* is to mark the exclusion of non-connection of the circumstantial with its controller, its exact nuance is difficult to determine. Since the circumstantial and its controller are in the plural, it may be used to express that the circumstantial holds true for all of its controllers. However, it may also be used as an emphazier to reinforce the unfavorable circumstance that the cheats wished to damage and thereby to enhance the concessive relation.⁵⁰⁰ Possibly both readings are evoked. I will comment on these nuances further below. Considering the interpretation as an emphazier, this is one of the cases where the emphasizing function is close to a degree modifying one, so that *dípsantas íd* might be rendered as ‘although they were wishing very much to damage’.

In addition to nouns, it seems that *íd* may have the function of an emphazier when it appears with adverbs, as the following example suggests:

(494) <i>devā́mś</i>	<i>ca</i>	<i>yā́bhir</i>	<i>yájate</i>	<i>dádāti</i>	<i>ca</i>	/
god:ACC.PL.M	and	REL:INS.PL.F	sacrifice:MID.3SG	give:3SG	and	
<i>jyóg</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>tā́bhiḥ</i>	<i>sacate</i>	<i>gópatiḥ</i>	<i>sahá</i>	
for.long	PRT	DEM:INS.PL.F	accompany:MID.3SG	cowherd:NOM.SG.M	with	

‘Those (cows) with which he sacrifices and gives to the gods, he keeps company with them as their cowherd for a **very** long time.’ RV 6.28.3cd

⁵⁰⁰ Cf. the translation of the identical pāda 1.147.3c by Monier-Williams (1899: 165): ‘the enemies wishing indeed to hurt were in nowise able to hurt’.

As the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 812) shows, the use as an emphazer may again lead to an interpretation as a degree modifier (cf. Geldner 1907–1909: I, 27). Compare ex. (180) in Section 4.5, where *cid* follows the adverb *jyók*.

Thus far, I have discussed the function of *íd* after nominal predicates/predicate nouns and I have extended this analysis to attributes, appositions, secondary predicates and also adverbs. For plural predicates/predicate nouns, I have argued that *íd* yields a reading that amounts to universal quantification of the subject. With singular nominal predicates and predicate nouns, as well as with attributes, appositions and secondary predicates, it functions as an emphazer or expresses epistemic modality, but in several cases, it is also interpretable as a degree modifier. In order to survey the different functions that *íd* can have after nominals it is furthermore necessary to consider cases in which it follows a predicate noun and in which the copula is not in the indicative. In the following example, the copula occurs in the optative:

(495) <i>revám̃</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>reváta</i>	<i>stotá</i>	/	<i>syát</i>
rich:NOM.SG.M	PRT	rich:GEN.SG.M	praiser:NOM.SG.M		be:OPT.3SG
<i>tuvávato</i>		<i>maghónaḥ</i>	/	<i>préd [= prá íd]</i>	<i>u</i>
like.you:GEN.SG.M		bountiful:GEN.SG.M		LP+PRT	PRT
<i>harivaḥ</i>		<i>śrutásya</i>			
with.bay.horses:VOC.SG.M		hear:PPP.GEN.SG.M			

‘Rich **indeed** should be the praiser of a rich benefactor like you, and far(-famed) **indeed** (the praiser) of a famous one, o possessor of the fallow bays.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1027)

‘**Every** praiser of a rich benefactor like you should be rich and, far(-famed) **every** praiser of a famous one, o possessor of the fallow bays.’ (my adaptation) RV 8.2.13

Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1027) translate *íd* by means of the emphazer ‘indeed’. I believe that in cases like these *íd* has the same function as when it occurs after finite verbs in the optative, which is one that I am not able to determine exactly (see Section 5.8). Notice, however, that *stotá* probably does not refer to a specific singer but that this example is a general statement concerning singers of benefactors (or specifically those who sing to Indra). As a result, it is also possible that the exclusion of non-connection that *íd* expresses here yields a universally quantified reading of the example that is also found with indicative copulas. Notice in addition the same function of *íd* in pāda c, where it occurs after the local particle *prá* and the finite verb *syát* ‘may he be’ is omitted (cf. Section 5.9). The next example exhibits a copula in the subjunctive mood:

(496) <i>yásya</i>	<i>tvám</i>	<i>agne</i>	<i>adhvarám̃</i>
REL:GEN.SG.M	2SG.NOM	Agni:VOC.SG.M	ceremony:ACC.SG.M
<i>jújoṣo</i>	/ [...] /	<i>prītéd [= prītá íd]</i>	<i>asad</i>
enjoy:PERF.SBJV.2SG		please:PPP:NOM.SG.F	be:SBJV.2SG

<i>dhótarā</i>	<i>sá</i>	<i>yaviṣṭha</i>
offering:NOM.SG.F	DEM:NOM.SG.F	young:SUP.VOC.SG.M

‘Whose ceremony you will enjoy, Agni—[...]**just** his ritual offering will be pleasing, o youngest one’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 560)

‘... the ritual offering will **certainly** be pleased, o youngest one’⁵⁰¹ RV 4.2.10a–c

This example differs from the previous one because here a quantificational interpretation is not possible. As the subjunctive expresses the speaker’s expectation, *íd* may be used to express epistemic modality, as is typically the case with finite verbs in the subjunctive (see Section 5.8). Yet, it may also reinforce the proposition and therefore have the effect of marking a high degree of *prītā* ‘pleasing/pleased’. Similarly elusive are examples in which the copula is in the imperative, as it is in the following passage:

(497) <i>bodhínmanā</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>astu</i>	<i>no</i>	/
with.attentive.mind:NOM.SG.M	PRT	be:IMP.3SG	1PL.ACC	
<i>vr̥trahā</i>	<i>bhūriāsutiḥ</i>			
Vṛtra.smasher:NOM.SG.M	with.many.drinks:NOM.SG.M			

‘Let him be of attentive mind **just** toward us—the Vṛtra-smiter possessing many pressed drinks.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1194)

‘Let him **truly** be of attentive mind toward us ...’ (my adaptation) RV 8.93.18ab

I assume that *íd* in this example reinforces the request in the same way that it reinforces a proposition in a declarative clause. The poet wants it to be fully true that Indra is of attentive mind to him and his associates and is not distracted in any way. Again, this leads to the perception that *íd* marks a high degree of *bodhínmanās* ‘of attentive mind’.

A further interesting case to examine is the following one. For here, unlike in all the other previous examples in this section, *íd* possibly occurs in a question:

(498) <i>kím</i>	<i>aṅgá</i>	<i>radhracódanaḥ</i>	/
PRT	PRT	rousing feeble:NOM.SG.M	
<i>sunvānásyāvitéd</i> [= <i>sunvānásya avitá íd</i>]	<i>asi</i>		
press:PTCP.PRS.MID.GEN.SG.M+helper:NOM.SG.M+PRT	be:2SG		

‘Are you **definitely** the rouser of the feeble, the helper of the presser?’⁵⁰²

‘Are you really one who rouses even the feeble, who are the helper of the soma-presser?’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1179) RV 8.80.3ab

⁵⁰¹ The translation follows Witzel et al. (2013: 118): ‘Wenn du, Agni, die gut bestimmte Opferhandlung eines Sterblichen als Gott genießen wirst, indem du (ihm) schenkst, wird die Opfergießung dann sicher befriedigt sein, du Jüngster?’.

⁵⁰² The translation follows Geldner (1951–1957: II, 407): ‘Bist du denn wirklich der Ermutiger des Schwachen, der Helfer des Pressenden?’.

In this passage, it is not clear whether *avitā́ id* is within the focus of the question or not. In the interpretation according to Geldner (1951–1957: II, 407), which I give in the example, it is.⁵⁰³ In accordance with this assumption, Tichy (1995a: 173) observes that *radhracódanas* ‘rousing the feeble’ and *avitā́* ‘helper’ have a parallel syntactic function.⁵⁰⁴ Etter (1985: 132) considers *radhracódanas* to be subordinate to *avitā́*.⁵⁰⁵ Conversely, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1179) assume that the focus of the question is *radhracódanas* whereas *sunvā́nāsya avitā́* is in the background. If pāda b is not within the focus of the question, I assume that *íd* has the same function as in ex. (491), i.e. it emphasizes the truth of the fact that Indra is a helper of the soma-presser. If pāda b is part of the question, the function of *íd* is more difficult to assess, but it may be similar to the one in declarative clauses. Notice in this regard that questions introduced by *kím aṅgá* are rhetorical questions (Etter 1985: 129f.; Coenen 2023: 153–157).

After I have given an overview of the functions that *íd* may have after nominals, another remark regarding the poetic language of the Rigveda is necessary, for its employment may, at least partly, also be determined by stylistic purposes:

(499) <i>ayám</i>	<i>ḱṛtnúr</i>	<i>ágrbhīto</i>	/
DEM:NOM.SG.M	able:NOM.SG.M	ungraspable:NOM.SG.M	
<i>viśvajíd</i>	<i>udbhíd</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>sómaḥ</i> /
all.conquering:NOM.SG.M	penetrating:NOM.SG.M	PRT	Soma:NOM.SG.M
<i>íṣir</i>	<i>vípraḥ</i>	<i>kāvīyena</i>	
poet:NOM.SG.M	inspired:NOM.SG.M	poetic.skill:INS.SG.N	

‘Here is the effective gambler, ungraspable, all-conquering Soma, who got the lucky break—a seer, an inspired poet with poetic skill.’ RV 8.79.1

This stanza contains several coordinated nominals, which are either attributes of *sómas* ‘Soma’ or nominal predicates of the clause (cf. Geldner 1951–1957: II, 406).⁵⁰⁶ The particle *íd* occurs only after *udbhíd* ‘bursting forth’ and I am not certain why the truth of this predicate should be emphasized in particular. However, according to Elizarenkova (1995: 133f.) the poets employ particles like *íd* also because of their phonological shape and here it is conspicuous that the first three words in pāda b end in *-íd -íd ít*. As I have already mentioned in previous sections, the sometimes-subtle function of *íd* enables the poet to place the particle for reasons that are primarily stylistic or metrical. This, as is vital to stress again, does not mean that *íd* is a mere expletive.

⁵⁰³ Similarly also Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 497): ‘Bist du des Matten Stärker nicht, des Somapressers Helfer nicht?’.

⁵⁰⁴ She translates ‘Bist du denn nicht derjenige, der für den Antrieb des Ermatteten sorgt, und der Helfer des Somapressenden?’.

⁵⁰⁵ She translates ‘Bist du, als derjenige der den Schwachen antreibt, denn nicht der Förderer des Somapressers?’.

⁵⁰⁶ ‘Dieser Soma ist der Spielgewinner, nicht zu fassen, allbesiegend, durchschlagend, ein durch Sehergabe bereiteter Rṣi’.

Thus far, I have proposed two major functions of *íd* in this section. Firstly, it may express universal quantification; secondly, it may function as an emphasizer. As it is conspicuous that both uses seem to involve the “exclusion of non-connection”, one may wonder whether these are two distinct functions or whether this is actually one single function with different manifestations depending on the context. More precisely, one may ask whether *íd* in the first reading should be interpreted as a genuine universal quantifier. I do not think that this is the case. I assume that the quantificational reading arises from the emphasizing one. Take for instance ex. (483) above. If the truth of the proposition that communities are under the lord of the Cedis’ foot is emphasized, this leads to the assumption that it holds true for all of them. This means that the exclusion of the non-truth of the proposition is reinterpreted as the exclusion of non-connection of an element from the set denoted by the subject and the property denoted by the predicate.⁵⁰⁷ This can also be seen in passages like ex. (493), where both interpretations are possible. In the following example, *íd* cannot be regarded a universal quantifier:

(500) <i>ávyuṣṭā</i>	<i>ín</i>	<i>nú</i>	<i>bhū́yasīr</i>
not.yet.shining:NOM.PL.F	PRT	no	much:COMP.NOM.PL.F
<i>uṣṭása</i>			
dawn:NOM.PL.F			

‘**Surely** many more dawns have not yet dawned’ RV 2.28.9c

This is again a case in which *íd* follows a nominal predicate in the plural and I would therefore expect a universally quantified reading of the subject. However, this is not possible because the subject nominal expression already contains another quantifier, namely *bhū́yasīs* ‘more’. As a result, the reading of universal quantification is cancelled and *íd* is understood as having the same function as in passages like ex. (473). This is also reflected in the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 442). This means that when it has the function discussed here, *íd* does not affect the truth conditions of a proposition when it appears after a nominal predicate.

Before concluding this section, I would like to remind the reader that I have started this section with the working hypothesis that *íd* after nominal predicates and predicate nouns is comparable to emphatic’ *just* in English. However, I have shown that *íd* after nominal predicates does not have the same function as this ‘emphatic’ *just*. Nevertheless, they do have something in common, namely that their interpretation is dependent on the context. Hence, the Rigveda contains also cases in which *íd* after a nominal has one of the functions that I have described in the previous sections rather than the ones I have discussed here. By ex. (476) above, I have already shown that *íd* can be used as a scalar exclusive particle after predicate nouns. Yet, the

⁵⁰⁷ The same may be true for ex. (495), where I am not certain about the exact function of *íd* with the optative copula, but where a universally quantified reading is possible as well.

different functions are not always easy to distinguish from the function of *íd* as an emphasizer. In the following example, I tentatively consider *íd* to function as a slack regulator in the following passage from a hymn to all the gods:

- (501) *viśve* *satómahānta* *ít*
all:NOM.PL.M equally.great:NOM.PL.M PRT
‘(you are) all **just** entirely great.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1091)
‘(you are) all **exactly** equally great.’ (my adaptation) RV 8.30.1c

I follow Grassmann (1873: 1451) and Monier-Williams (1899: 1138) in translating *satómahat-* as ‘equally great’. I assume that *íd* emphasizes the identity of the greatness of the gods. Notice that here the subset relation of S and P is already expressed by the universal quantifier *viśve* ‘all’. Nevertheless, the two uses are hard to distinguish in this passage. For an interpretation as an emphasizer ‘they are truly equally great’ leads to a decreased tolerance for exceptions as well. This is similar to the following example, where *íd* occurs after a demonstrative which functions as the predicate noun. Here, *íd* is probably used for emphatic assertion of identity (cf. Hejib 1984: 229f.):

- (502) *kr̥dhí* *rátanam* *susanitar* *dhánānām* /
do:IMP.2SG wealth:ACC.SG.N good.winner:VOC.SG.M prize:GEN.PL.N
*sághéd [=gha **íd**]* *agne* *bhavasi* *yát*
DEM:NOM.SG.M+PRT+PRT Agni:VOC.SG.M become:2SG when
sámiddhah
LP.kindle:PPP.NOM.SG.M

- ‘Create wealth, o you who are good at winning the stakes—when kindled, you become **just** that, o Agni’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 491)
‘Give us treasures, O best gainer of riches : such **indeed** art thou, Agni, when thou hast been kindled.’ (Oldenberg 1897: 277) RV 3.18.5ab

Here as well, emphasizing the truth of the proposition can also be interpreted as emphatic assertion of identity, as the translation by Oldenberg suggests.

In this section, I have investigated the functions that *íd* can have after nominals with different syntactic functions, including nominal predicates and predicate nouns, secondary predicates, attributes and appositions. Starting the investigation with nominal predicates, I have been able to determine that unlike English *just*, *íd* is not to be analyzed as an extreme degree modifier (exx. (478), (479)). Rather, a comparison with the similar particle *eva* in Classical Sanskrit suggests that *íd* expresses universal quantification, especially when the predicate and subject are in the plural (ex. (483)). When the predicate is in the singular, *íd* appears to be an emphasizer (ex. (473)). As for the quantificational reading of *íd*, I assume that it does not constitute actual universal quantification because this reading is cancelled in certain contexts

(ex. (500)). I have argued that *íd* possesses this function not only with nominal predicates and predicate nouns but also with attributes (ex. (489)), appositions (ex. (477)) and secondary predicates (ex. (490)). Moreover, I have shown that it occurs with different kinds of nominals, like agent nouns (ex. (491), (492)) and participles (ex. (493)), both of which may denote verbal actions. The particle *íd* is also found after predicate nouns when the copula is not in the indicative (exx. (495)–(497)). In these cases, I assume *íd* to have the same functions as after finite verbs but it appears to be possible that under the right conditions such clauses also imply universal quantification. In questions, *íd* may be used as a device to indicate that the speaker wants to make sure his assumptions are correct (ex. (498)). Passages like exx. (476) show that the position of *íd* after a nominal alone is not indicative of its function, although the functions may sometimes be difficult to identify.

5.8 *íd* after finite verbs

In the previous section, I discussed the possible functions of the particle *íd* when it occurs after nominal predicates and predicate nouns. In the current section, I will go on to discuss the attestations of *íd* after another type of predicate, namely finite verbs. As a first step, I will discuss a prosodic phenomenon, namely that *íd* has the potential to cause a finite verb in a main clause, which is usually unaccented, to carry an accent. I will show that there are only a few cases which are eligible for such an investigation and I will show that in the apparent counterexamples, the unaccented verb follows an accented local particle, with which it forms a semantic unit. The next step is then to analyze the function of *íd* in this position. I will argue that the interpretation of *íd* partly depends on the mood of the verb but that in most cases, it signals a link between the clause in which it occurs and the preceding context.

5.8.1 *íd* and verbal accent

Throughout the Rigveda, the particle *íd* occurs 69 times after a finite verb. Before analyzing the function of *íd* in this position, it is necessary to deal with a prosodic peculiarity that may arise when *íd* follows a finite verb. This peculiarity regards the accentuation of the verb. It is a general rule that in Vedic, finite verbs are only accented when they occur in subordinate clauses; when they occur in main clauses, they are generally unaccented, unless they occur in the initial position of a clause or pāda (Delbrück 1888: 35–37). This general rule can be exemplified by the following three text passages:

(503) <i>sá</i>		<i>devāṃ</i>	<i>éhá</i>		<i>vakṣati</i>
DEM:NOM.SG.M		god:ACC.PL.M	LP+here		pull:AOR.SBJV.3SG
‘he will carry the gods here to this place.’ RV 1.1.2c					
(504) <i>yád</i>	<i>aṅgá</i>	<i>dāśúṣe</i>	<i>tuvám</i>	/	<i>ágne</i>
when	PRT	pious:DAT.SG.M	2SG.NOM		Agni:VOC.SG.M
<i>bhadráṃ</i>		<i>kariṣyási</i>	/ [...]		
blessed:ACC.SG.M		do:FUT.2SG			

‘When truly you **will do** good for the pious man, o Agni, [...]’ RV 1.1.6ab

(505) <i>pácantī</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>vṛṣabhám</i>
cook:3PL	2SG.DAT	bull:ACC.PL.M

‘They cook bulls for you.’ RV 10.28.3c

In ex. (503), the finite verb *vakṣati* ‘he will carry’ is the predicate of a main clause and thus unaccented. In contrast, *kariṣyási* ‘you will do’ in ex. (504) is accented because it is the predicate of a subordinate clause, which is introduced by the conjunction *yád* ‘when’. The verb *pácantī* ‘they cook’ in (505) is the predicate of a main clause but it is nevertheless accented because it occupies the initial position of the pāda and the clause. This prosodic rule is important for the present study because when *íd* occurs immediately after a finite verb, it appears to cause an exception to this rule: Delbrück (1888: 37) mentions several passages in which a finite verb followed by *íd* is accented even though it is the predicate of a main clause (cf. also Hettrich 1988: 142–144). Hettrich (1988: 156) even formulates the accentuation of the verb before *íd* as a rule.⁵⁰⁸ In grammars and dictionaries of the Vedic language, the accentuation of the verb preceding *íd* is described differently, either as a strict rule (e.g. Grassmann 1873: 206) or only as a possibility (e.g. Macdonell 1916: 467). Renou (1952: 74) appears to be indecisive.⁵⁰⁹ Klein (1992: 2; 1997a: 140) calls the accentuation of the verb followed by *íd* “an iconic indication of emphasis”. With respect to emphatic accent in general, he (1992: 85; 1997a: 140) observes that unlike the accent of a verb that occurs in the first position of a clause, it is optional. Yet, before *íd* he (1994: 116) regards it as “grammaticalized”. An example of an accented verb followed by *íd* is the following text passage:

(506) <i>amarmáṇo</i>	<i>vidád</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>asya</i>
invulnerable:GEN.SG.M	find:AOR.INJ.3SG	PRT	DEM:GEN.SG.M

⁵⁰⁸ “[...], wenn [...] Emphase als Grund für die Betonung anzunehmen ist, so regulär vor unmittelbar folgendem *íd*”.

⁵⁰⁹ “Ist das Verb mit keinem Richtungsworte (Präpos.) versehen, so steht *íd* hinter dem Verb und dies ist dann stets betont” (Grassmann); “Sometimes the verb when emphatic, though not beginning the sentence, is accented if followed by the particles *íd* or *caná*” (Macdonell); “La subordination implicite, la séquence d’un second verbe créant antithèse, le soulignement par la particule *íd* (y compris *kuvíd*), *caná* (ou, isolément, par telle autre particule insistante), entraînent constamment ou fréquemment la tonicité du verbe” (Renou). Grassmann mentions ex. (511) below as an exception.

márma
vulnerable.point:ACC.SG.N

‘He found **just** that vulnerable place of him (who thought himself) invulnerable’ RV 5.32.5b

This example consists of a main clause, in which one would expect the presence of an unaccented finite verb. However, *vidád* ‘he found’, which is followed by *íd*, bears an accent. Jamison (comm.V: ad loc.) explains that the verb “is accented because of the following *íd*”. However, in addition to the fact that the accentuation of a verb before *íd* appears to be optional, she points to another problem. For even though Jamison (comm.V: ad loc.) regards the presence of *íd* as the reason for the accented verb in (506), she concedes that in many of the passages that Grassmann (1873: 205f.) lists as instances of *íd* preceded by an accented verb, the verb occupies the first position in the pāda. In this position, the verb is accented regardless of the presence of *íd*.⁵¹⁰ Such an instance of pāda/sentence initial *íd* can be seen in example (507):

(507) *ámanmahíd* [= *ámanmahi íd*] *anāśávo* /
think:IPRF.MID.1PL+PRT not.swift:NOM.PL.M

anugrāsaś *ca* *vṛtrahan*
not.strong:NOM.PL.M and Vṛtra.smasher:VOC.SG.M

‘**Indeed** we have considered ourselves neither swift nor strong, you Vṛtra-smasher.’ RV 8.1.14

As Klein (1997a: 159) remarks, one has to distinguish between verbs that are accented because they occur at the beginning of a clause and those that are accented due to emphasis: “Verbal accentuation preceding *íd* is attributable to emphasis, another iconic feature not identical with, but clearly related to the demarcative, attention-getting heightening of pitch and/or expiratory force at the beginning of an utterance. Whereas sentence-initial accent is invariant, emphasis is an optional feature that can affect any word in a sentence”. Hence, if a large portion of the cases in which *íd* follows an accented verb are comparable ex. (507), the phenomenon of verbal accentuation caused by *íd* is not only optional but also quite rare.

The phenomenon that a peculiar accentuation of a verb has been attributed to the presence of a particle is not restricted to *íd*. Thus, for instance, Whitney (1889: 226) identifies further “more or less doubtful cases in which a verb-form is perhaps accented for emphasis[, namely] sporadically before **caná** *in any wise*, and in connection with asseverative particles, as **kíla**, **aṅgá**, **evá** and (in [Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa], regularly) **hánta**”. Remember furthermore that *cid* has been claimed to cause verbal accent as well, but in Section 4.1 I showed that in the only clear example of *cid* after a finite verb in the Rigveda, the verb is in clause-initial position.

⁵¹⁰ Delbrück (1888: 37) made the same observation: “In den übrigen Stellen, welche Grassmann unter *íd* 5 anführt, ist das Verbum aus einem andern Grunde betont”.

Uncertainties regarding the relation between verbal accentuation and particles like those described here show that it is advisable to conduct a re-examination of *íd* and verbal accentuation, especially in light of the observations made by Klein and Jamison.

As the formal criteria for the accentuation of finite verbs followed by *íd* are fairly clear, I am able to give a quantitative analysis here. A list of passages in which a verb is accented due to the presence of *íd* is provided by Delbrück (1888: 37) and in the RIVELEX (II, 158), which marks passages in which it considers the verbal accent to be caused by *íd* with a footnote referring to Delbrück. Nevertheless, since syntactic interpretations of the relevant passages may differ, I will re-examine all attestations of *íd* after a verb here. Of the 69 times that *íd* occurs after a finite verb, in 43 cases the verb occurs in pāda-initial position. In 26 cases, it does not occur pāda-initially. Of these 26 cases, there are 6 in which *íd* occurs after a verb in a subordinate clause. In one case, *íd* occurs after a verb in a clause containing the particle *hí* ‘for’. In this clause type, the verb is regularly accented as well (Hettrich 1988: 171). In another 6 cases, the verb followed by *íd* assumes the first position of a clause which does not coincide with the first position of the pāda. Note that it is not always entirely clear whether the verb occurs in the first position or not, as in the following passage:

(508) <i>ná</i>	<i>yám</i>	<i>hímsanti</i>	<i>dhítáyo</i>	<i>ná</i>
NEG	REL:ACC.SG.M	harm:3PL	thought:NOM.PL.F	NEG
<i>vāñīr</i>	/	<i>índram</i>	<i>nákṣantíd</i> [= <i>nákṣanti íd</i>]	<i>abhí</i>
voice:NOM.PL.F		Indra:ACC.SG.M	reach:3PL+PRT	LP
<i>vardháyantīh</i>				
strengthen:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.PL.F				

‘They make their way to Indra and exalt him, him whom no prayers and no laudations trouble’ (Griffith 1896–1897: I, 594)

‘Indra, whom neither insightful thoughts nor voices harm; they **just** approach him, making him strong.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 818) RV 6.34.3ab

In the interpretation by Griffith (1896–1897: I, 594) all of pāda a constitutes the relative clause and all of pāda b constitutes the main clause. Accordingly, *nákṣanti* ‘they reach’ occurs both within the pāda and the clause. Accordingly, RIVELEX (II, 158) regards the verbal accent to be caused by *íd*. In contrast, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 818) assume that there is an enjambement and regard *índram* ‘Indra’ as part of the relative clause in pāda a. This means that *nákṣanti* is in clause-initial position (see Jamison comm.VI.2: ad loc.). As both interpretations

are possible, I do not regard cases like this as clear cases of verbal accentuation determined by the following *íd*.⁵¹¹

In an additional case (RV 1.190.5), the verb followed by *íd* occurs after an initial vocative, which is not part of the clause (Delbrück 1888: 36, see also Jamison comm.I.2: ad loc.). As the verb can therefore be regarded as clause-initial, I do not include this passage into my study either.⁵¹² In addition, there are two further cases that are not entirely clear but in which the accent of the verb may be explained otherwise:

(509) <i>iyám</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>ṛtvíyāvātī</i>	/	<i>dhītír</i>
DEM:NOM.SG.F	2SG.DAT	orderly:NOM.SG.F		thought:NOM.SG.F
<i>eti</i>	<i>návīyasī</i>	/	<i>saparyántī</i>	
go:3SG	new:COMP.NOM.SG.F		worship:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.F	
<i>purupriyá</i>	<i>mímīta</i>	<i>ít</i>		
much.loved:NOM.SG.F	measure:MID.3SG	PRT		

‘This newer visionary thought goes to you, conforming to her season [/to the ritual sequence]. Rendering service, dear to many—she is (well-)measured **indeed**.’ RV 8.12.10

The final words of this stanza *mímīte íd* ‘it is measured indeed’ are repeated in the following two stanzas. In stanza 11, it constitutes a clause of its own so that this is one of the cases in which the verb is accented because of its first position in the clause. However, in ex. (509) as well as in stanza 13 the verb occurs clause-internally. As a result, Elizarenkova (1995: 255) assumes that *mímīte* is accented because it is followed by *íd*. Yet, Jamison (comm.VIII.1: ad loc.) argues that since *mímīte íd* is repeated in three subsequent stanzas, it receives its accent because it is a refrain. She refers to stanzas 5 and 6 of this hymn, where the verbs are also unexpectedly accented and where she follows Oldenberg (1909–1912: II, 87) in assuming that the finite verb constitutes the refrain of these stanzas and is accented for this reason. See here this last pāda of stanza 5:

(510) <i>índra</i>	<i>vísvābhir</i>	<i>ūtībhir</i>	<i>vavákṣitha</i>
Indra:NOM.SG.M	all:INS.PL.F	help:INS.PL.F	become.strong:PERF.2SG

‘O Indra, with all your forms of help you have waxed strong.’ RV 8.12.5c

As can be seen, unlike in ex. (509) there is no particle present which might cause the accent. A different solution for the problem of the unexpected accentuation is provided by Lubotsky

⁵¹¹ RIVELEX (II:162) mentions the possibility that in RV 9.96.15 a clause boundary might be present before the accented verb. However, I follow the translations in assuming that no such boundary is present. Jamison (comm.IX.1: ad loc.) assumes that the accent is caused by *íd* in this passage too.

⁵¹² As a further case of this type, one might adduce RV 1.82.1, where the verb occurs after the connective *ád* ‘then’. However, in this passage, it appears to function as the correlative of *yadā* ‘when’ in the subclause. Conspicuous is also RV 1.104.5, where the verb occurs after the connective *ádha*, which is followed by two clitics and a vocative. In both cases, I regard *íd* as clause-internal.

(1997: 1059; 1215): In stanzas 5 and 6 as well as in stanzas 10, 11 and 12, he assumes a pāda boundary before the accented verb forms. If this is correct, the pāda-initial position causes the accent rather than *íd*. At any rate, stanzas 10 and 12 do not seem to be clear cases in which the accentuation of the finite verb in the main clause can be attributed to *íd*.

This means that of the 69 cases where *íd* occurs after a finite verb, there are only 10 in which the presence of an accent could be certainly attributed to *íd*. Indeed, in the majority of these cases the verb is accented: It has an accent in 7 cases whereas it is unaccented in only 3 cases. Note again that Delbrück (1888: 37) gives a list of passages in which he considers the accent of the verb to be caused by *íd* and that RIVELEX (II, 158) marks passages in which it considers the verbal accent to be caused by *íd* with a footnote referring to Delbrück. However, both their results do not fully agree with mine (see my appendix). I give here the three passages that contain unaccented verbs before *íd*. Note that in all three examples, I consider *íd* to be associated with the verb:

(511) <i>vísvaṃ</i>	<i>sá</i>	<i>dhatte</i>	<i>dráviṇaṃ</i>	
all:ACC.SG.N	DEM:NOM.SG.M	put:MID:3SG	wealth:ACC.SG.N	
<i>yám</i>	<i>ínvasi</i>	/	<i>ātithyám</i>	<i>agne</i>
REL:ACC.SG.M	drive:2SG		hospitality:ACC.SG.N	Agni:VOC.SG.M
<i>ca</i>	<i>dhatta</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>puráh</i>	<i>ní</i>
and	put:MID.3SG	PRT	LP	LP

‘He acquires all material wealth whom you urge onward, and he sets his hospitality in front, o Agni.’ RV 5.28.2cd

(512) <i>ahám</i>	<i>índro</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>párā</i>	<i>jigya</i>	<i>íd</i>
1SG.NOM	Indra:NOM.SG.M	NEG	LP	win:PERF.MID.1SG	PRT
<i>dhánaṃ</i>	/	<i>ná</i>	<i>mṛtyáve</i>	<i>áva</i>	<i>tasthe</i>
prize:ACC.SG.N		NEG	death:DAT.SG.M	LP	stand:PERF.MID.1SG
<i>kádā</i>	<i>caná</i>				
when	PRT				

‘I am Indra: **only** I have not had the stake won away, and never have I given way to death.’ RV 10.48.5ab

(513) <i>yátrā</i>	<i>vádete</i>	<i>ávaraḥ</i>	<i>páraś</i>	<i>ca</i>	/
where	speak:MID.3DU	lower:NOM.SG.M	higher:NOM.SG.M	and	
<i>yajñaníyoḥ</i>		<i>kataró</i>	<i>nau</i>	<i>ví</i>	
leader.of.sacrifice:GEN.DU.M		which:NOM.SG.M	2DU.GEN	LP	
<i>veda</i>	/	<i>á</i>	<i>śekur</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>sadhamádaṃ</i>
know:PERF.3SG		LP	be.able:PERF.3PL	PRT	joint.revelry:ACC.SG.M
<i>sákhāyo</i>	/	<i>nákṣanta</i>	<i>yajñám</i>	<i>ká</i>	
comrade:NOM.PL.M		reach:INJ.MID.3PL	sacrifice:ACC.SG.M	who:NOM.SG.M	
<i>idám</i>	<i>ví</i>	<i>vocat</i>			
DEM:ACC.SG.N	LP	speak:AOR.INJ.3SG			

‘When the lower [/nearer] one and the higher [/farther] one debate with each other, (they ask) “Of the two leaders of the sacrifice, which of us two knows it through and through?” Have our comrades been able to achieve joint revelry? Have they realized the sacrifice? Who can proclaim this here?’ RV 10.88.17

The obvious question is now whether these passages have something in common that distinguishes them from the other 7 passages, which exhibit verbal accent. With respect to ex. (511), Oldenberg (1897: 424) wonders why *dhatte* ‘he takes’ is not accented but his doubts are not caused by *íd*. He wonders about the missing accent because he would prefer to translate pāda d as a subclause. Nonetheless, he (1906: 738, 1909–1912: I, 325) surmises that pāda d is probably a main clause (see also Velankar 2003: 177), but he does not comment on the presence of *íd*. A conspicuous fact regarding the verb form *dhatte* ‘he takes’ is that it is repeated, albeit with the additional local particle *ní* and therefore a different nuance in meaning. One may argue here that *dhatte* is background material and therefore does not receive stress. Yet, this cannot be the crucial factor because the other two examples do not exhibit such a pattern. Moreover, there is a passage in which the verb is accented before *íd* and which does exhibit such a pattern:

(514) <i>sám</i>	<i>usríyābhiḥ</i>	<i>pratirán</i>	<i>na</i>
LP	ruddy:INS.PL.F	LP.cross:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.M	1PL.GEN
<i>áyuh</i>	// <i>eṣá</i>	<i>syá</i>	<i>sómo</i>
lifetime:ACC.SG.N	DEM:NOM.SG.M	DEM:NOM.SG.M	Soma:NOM.SG.M
<i>matíbhiḥ</i>	<i>punānó</i>	/ <i>átyo</i>	<i>ná</i>
thought:INS.PL.F	purify:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M	steed:NOM.SG.M	like
<i>vājī</i>	<i>táratíd [= táрати íd]</i>	<i>árātīḥ</i>	
prizewinning:NOM.SG.M	cross:3SG+PRT	hostility:ACC.PL.F	

‘along with the ruddy (cows), prolonging our lifetime.

15. This very Soma, being purified by poetic thoughts, like a prizewinning steed **just** outstrips hostilities.’ RV 9.96.14d–15b

In pāda 14d, the participle *pratirán* ‘prolonging’, which contains the local particle *prá*, belongs to the verbal root *tṛ-*. This root is also present in the finite predicate of the following clause, *táрати* ‘he outstrips’. The situation here is not exactly the same as in ex. (511) but it is at least comparable. As a result, although it may play a role, I do not regard the occurrence of the same verb in the directly preceding context as the sole determining factor for the lack of the verb’s accent before *íd*. What ex. (514) also shows is that the accent on the verb need not be “contrastively emphatic”, even though Klein (1997b: 277f.) regards this as the main function. As for ex. (513), a conspicuous feature is that Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1534) translate pāda

c as a question. However, this is not a certain interpretation. For instance Geldner (1951–1957: III, 282f.) and Renou (1955–1969: XIV, 24) interpret it as a declarative clause.⁵¹³

What is conspicuous with respect to the three examples in which *íd* follows an unaccented verb is that in each one, a local particle appears close by. In fact, Renou (1952: 375) states that a verb followed by *íd* is accented unless it is accompanied by a preverb, i.e. a local particle (see also Viti 2007: 37).⁵¹⁴ However, the following passage shows that the mere presence of a local particle is not sufficient for the verbal accent to be absent before *íd*:

(515) <i>úpa</i>	<i>dhrájantam</i>		<i>ádrayo</i>
LP	move:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.SG.M		stone:NOM.PL.M
<i>vidhánn</i>		<i>ít</i>	
honor:AOR.INJ.3PL		PRT	

‘The stones **just** honor him as he soars near.’ RV 1.149.1c

With Grassmann (1873: 1280) and RIVELEX (II, 328), I assume that *upá* is to be construed with *vidhán* and not with *dhrájantam*. A closer look reveals that this passage differs from exx. (511), (512) and (513): In exx. (512) and (513), a stressed local particle is adjacent to the finite verb; in ex. (511), only the enclitic *ca* ‘and’ occurs between the local particle and the verb. A similar observation has also been made by Klein (1992: 88), who mentions ex. (511) as an exception to the rule that the word preceding *íd* is accented, and he attributes this to the fact that the verb is cliticized to a stressed host. In a similar vein, RIVELEX (II, 162) remarks with respect to ex. (513) “Nach dem Präfixverb *áśekur*”. Of particular interest here is that the general rules of verbal accentuation in subordinate and main clauses, which I have outlined in the beginning of this section, affect local particles as well: When a finite verb in a subordinate clause is accented and a local particle directly precedes it, the local particle loses its accent unless it occurs in the first position of the clause or pāda (Hettrich et al. 2004 [2010]: 22). Reinöhl & Casaretto (2018: 260) exemplify the difference between main and subordinate clause by the following passages:

(516) <i>índraśya</i>	<i>nú</i>	<i>vīrīyāṇi</i>	<i>prá</i>	<i>vocam</i>
Indra:GEN.SG.M	now	heroic.deed:ACC.PL.N	LP	speak:AOR.INJ.1SG

‘Now I shall **proclaim** the heroic deeds of Indra’ RV 1.32.1a

(517) <i>yó</i>	<i>árvantam</i>	<i>prathamó</i>	<i>adhyátiṣṭhat</i>
REL:NOM.SG.M	horse:ACC.SG.M	first:NOM.SG.M	LP.stand:IPRF.3SG

‘who first mounted the steed.’ RV 1.163.9d

⁵¹³ ‘Die Genossen haben die gemeinsame Trankfeier zustande gebracht’ (Geldner); ‘Les amis ont déployé-leurs-forces pour le symposion (des dieux)’ (Renou).

⁵¹⁴ “Le mot provoque l’accentuation du verbe si celui-ci précède immédiatement et n’est pas muni d’un préverbe”.

In the first example, a main clause, the local particle *prá* is accented and the verb is not; in the second example, a relative clause, the verb is accented and the local particle *adhi* is not. In the latter case the two forms are traditionally written as a single word. These two examples show that adjacent local particles and finite verbs form a prosodic unit. As a result, it might be that to the speakers of Vedic, this unit was perceived as accented even if only the local particle but not the finite verb carried the accent (cf. Klein 1992: 52). In exx. (512) and (513), this prosodic unit consists of the local particle and the verb; in ex. (511), it consists of the local particle, the enclitic *ca* and the verb. In contrast, in the passages where the verb is accented, either no local particle is present, as in exx. (506) and (514), or it occurs in a position that is distant from the verb, as in ex. (515). Hence the verb does not form a prosodic unit with another element.

Even though I consider the analysis I have proposed here plausible, it is possible that the decisive factor for the lack of accent is not the position of the local particle but its semantic relationship with the finite verb. As I have mentioned, Renou (1952: 375) names the presence of a preverb as the crucial factor. A preverb is actually a local particle “that forms a semantic unit with a verb” (Casaretto & Schneider 2015: 225). However, local particles can also have other functions (see Section 5.9). Indeed, in ex. (512) *párā* is probably a preverb (cf. Schneider 2012: 236), and for *ní* in ex. (511) and *á* in ex. (513) such an analysis is at least not unlikely (cf. Schneider 2009 [2010]: 154f., RIVELEX II, 5). Notice, however, that it is often difficult to determine the exact syntactic status of a local particle. Moreover, it seems plausible to assume that *úpa* has a rather close semantic relationship with the verb in ex. (515) too (cf. RIVELEX II, 328).

Assuming that the position of the local particle is actually the determining factor, the remaining question is then why the accentuation pattern in exx. (511), (512) and (513) differs from the one in ex. (517), where the verb is accented because it occurs in a subclause. This may be explained by the fact that according to Klein (1997a: 158–162), the emphatic accent caused by *íd* is of a different nature than the accent in subordinate clauses. Thus, he argues, for instance, that the accented verbs in subclauses cannot be regarded as emphasized. Instead, he observes common features of emphatic accent and the accent at the beginning of a sentence or a *pāda*. Notice in this regard that the accentuation of local particle and adjacent finite verb is identical to the one in clause- and *pāda* initial position:⁵¹⁵

(518) *abhí* *syāma* *pr̥tanyatáḥ*
 LP be:OPT.1PL fight:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.PL.M

‘May we surmount those who do battle.’ RV 2.8.6d

⁵¹⁵ It is, however, also identical to the pattern in clause-internal position (cf. ex. (516)).

This is especially well observable in ex. (513), where *á śekus ít* actually occurs pāda-initially. What is of further interest here is that the local particles in exx. (511), (512) and (513) all occur after a prosodic boundary: In ex. (513) *á* occurs after a pāda boundary, as I have just mentioned. In exx. (511) and (512), *ní* and *áva* occur after the caesura, a break after the fourth or fifth syllable in pādas with eleven or twelve syllables. Hock (1996: 251–254) finds that occasionally, finite verb forms are accented when they occur after prosodic boundaries even if they are pāda-internal like the caesura.

In this section, I have discussed the first of two questions regarding *íd* after finite verb, namely the one regarding the verbal accent, which according to the literature is caused by *íd*. I have found that only 10 passages are eligible for such an investigation. Considering these passages, I conclude that the accentuation before this particle is not optional. In 7 passages, the verb is clearly accented. The 3 apparent counterexamples are all cases in which the finite verb forms a prosodic unit with a preceding local particle, which is accented. This means that the emphatic accentuation by *íd* differs from the one in subordinate clauses because there it is the verb instead of the adjacent local particle which is accented. Instead, the pattern is comparable to the one in clause or pāda-initial positions. These findings are in accordance with the analysis of the different kinds of accents by Klein (1997a: 158–162). Moreover, my re-examination of the Rigvedic data confirms the view that emphatic accent is obligatory before *íd* (e.g. Klein 1994: 116).

5.8.2 The functions of *íd* after a finite verb.

Having discussed the problem of verb accentuation related to *íd*, I will now begin to analyze the functions *íd* has after finite verbs. Dictionaries and glossaries like Grassmann (1873: 205f.) and Geldner (1907–1909: I, 27f.) give various particles and adverbs as possible translations. Moreover, several authors assign *íd* the function of affirmation (e.g. Tichy 2004: 44). In order to determine the exact function of *íd* in this context, a closer examination is necessary. As has been the case in previous sections of this study, a comparison with other particles that are similar to *íd* can be fruitful. Varma (2006) investigates the Hindi particle *hii*, whose range of functions is similar to those of *íd*. He (2006: 116f.) finds that “[a]ccompanying a verb, *hii* often indicates a high degree of certainty; the speaker is definite about what she is saying”. One of the examples that he gives is the following:

(519) <i>vah</i>	<i>hogaa</i>	<i>hii.</i>
that	be:FUT.3M.SG	<i>hii</i>

states that *íd* after a verb “has the effect of binding the *íd* clause very closely with the preceding one”, although she also seems to assume this function for other positions of *íd* as well. In exx. (520) and (521), such a relation holds as well. In ex. (520), pāda b describes the result of the actions described in pāda a. This is especially clear, because pāda a is a subordinate clause marked by the conjunction *céd*. In ex. (521) pāda c is an explanation of pāda b. It explains why Indra’s benefit is worth wishing for.

There is one passage in which *íd* with a subjunctive occurs in a relative clause and in which it does not seem to express certainty:

(522) <i>yó</i>		<i>yájāti</i>		<i>yájāta</i>		<i>ít</i>	/
REL:NOM.SG.M		sacrifice:SBJV.3SG		sacrifice:SBJV.MID.3SG		PRT	
<i>sunávac</i>	<i>ca</i>	<i>pácāti</i>		<i>ca</i>	/	<i>brahméd</i>	
press:SBJV.3SG	and	cook:SBJV.3SG		and		formulator:NOM.SG.M+PRT	
<i>índrasya</i>		<i>cākanat</i>					
Indra:GEN.SG.M		be.satisfied:PERF.SBJV.3SG					

‘Whoever will sacrifice for another and will **also** sacrifice for himself, who will press (soma) and will cook (the oblation), just that formulator will find pleasure of Indra.’ RV 8.31.1

It is conspicuous that two subjunctive forms of the verb *yáj-* ‘sacrifice’ occur directly next to each other, one in the active and the other in the middle voice, which Renou (1955–1969: XVI, 117) calls a “juxtaposition typique des voix”. Hence, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1092) translate *íd* as ‘also’. In contrast, Tichy (2006: 258) renders *íd* as ‘really’ (‘wirklich’).⁵¹⁷ If Tichy’s analysis is correct, the function that *íd* exhibits here is comparable to that as an emphazier which I have assumed for *íd* after nominal predicates and predicate nouns (Section 5.7). Since the function of the subjunctive in the relative clause is different to the expectative function in exx. (520) and (521), Kümmel (2000: 131) also renders *íd* as ‘really’ (‘wirklich’), but he assumes that only *yás yájāti* ‘who sacrifices’ is the subclause and the rest of pāda a as well as pāda b is the main clause.⁵¹⁸ I do not follow his syntactic interpretation. At any rate, there is again a close relationship between the predicate followed by *íd* and the previous predicate, viz. its active counterpart.

The particle *íd* occurs also after verbs in the imperative. The Rigveda contains 15 attestations of this kind. I assume that *íd* has adhortative function of some kind in these cases, similar to the function that Klein (1982) assumes for the particles *tú* and *sú* after imperatives, but I am uncertain about the nuance that the presence of *íd* conveys. As is the case with the

⁵¹⁷ ‘Wer opfert, wirklich in seinem eigenen Interesse opfert, und auch preßt und kocht, der Brahmane wird an Indra wirklich Freude haben’.

⁵¹⁸ ‘Der opfern wird, soll wirklich für sich opfern und pressen und kochen’.

verbs in the subjunctive mood, there appears to be a certain relationship with the preceding clause, which can be different in nature. As every passage would have to be discussed individually to demonstrate the exact nature of this relation, I will only exemplify the range of possible relations by means of the following examples:

(523) *sunótā somapāvane / sómam índrāya*
 press:IMP.2PL soma.drinker:DAT.SG.M soma:ACC.SG.M Indra:DAT.SG.M
vajríne / pácatā paktír
 with.mace:DAT.SG.M cook:IMP.2PL cooked.food:ACC.PL.F
ávase kṛṇudhvám ít
 help:DAT.SG.N do:IMP.MID.2PL PRT

‘Press soma for soma-drinking Indra who holds the mace. Cook cooked dishes. **Just** cause (him) to help.’ RV 7.32.8a–c

(524) *túbhyaṃ sutó maghavan túbhya° pakvó*

addhí indra píba ca prásthitasya //
 eat:IMP.2SG Indra:VOC.SG.M drink:IMP.2SG and LP.stand:PPP.GEN.SG.M
addhíd [=addhí íd] indra prásthitemá
 eat:IMP.2SG+PRT Indra:VOC.SG.M LP.stand:PPP.ACC.PL.N+DEM.ACC.PL.N
havīṃṣi /
 oblation:ACC.PL.N

cáno dadhiṣva pacatótá sómam

‘It is pressed for you, bounteous one, and cooked for you: eat and drink of it when it is presented, Indra.

8. Eat **just** these oblations presented here, Indra. Take your delight in the cooked foods and the soma.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1586)

‘... **Do** eat these offerings, oh Indra, that are ready for you; ...’ (Velankar 1954: 7) RV 10.116.7c–8b

(525) *yád adó divó arṇavá / iṣó*
 when there heaven:GEN.SG.M flood:LOC.SG.M refreshment:GEN.SG.F
vā mádatho gṛhé / śrutám ín
 or be.exhilarated:2DU house:LOC.SG.M hear:AOR.IMP.2DU PRT
me amartiyā
 1SG.GEN immortal:VOC.DU.M

‘Whether you find exhilaration yonder in the flood of heaven or in the house of refreshment, listen **just** to me, immortal ones.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1084)

‘... listen to me **nevertheless**.’ (my adaptation) RV 8.26.17

In ex. (523), the last clause appears to be a kind of summary of the preceding two clauses, because pressing soma and cooking for Indra is what causes him to help. It therefore appears to be some kind of climax, formulating the actual goals of the ritual actions. In ex. (524) the request containing *íd* is similar to the one made directly before (see also Jamison comm.X.4: ad loc.). Perhaps *íd* is used here to add some urgency to the request. Compare also the repeated

imperative, the second of which is followed by *íd*, in ex. (446) in Section 5.4.2. Ex. (525) contains an alternative concessive conditional. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1084) and Jamison (comm.VIII.1: ad loc.) assume that *íd* has exclusive function and that the enclitic *me* ‘to me’ is its focus. However, I do not find this appropriate because then I would expect other people to occur in the preceding clause as alternatives of *me*. However, what is explicitly mentioned is not different people but different places. The distant places and the fact that he is exhilarated are an unfavorable circumstance for the request that the Aśvins, who are addressed, listen to the poet. I assume that the function of *íd* is to emphasize that the poet utters this request even though he is aware that the Aśvins are often far away and enjoy their stay at the distant places.

In one passage, it is difficult to determine the relationship between the clause containing the imperative and the preceding clause:

(526) <i>prá</i>	<i>vāyāvah</i>	<i>pānti</i>	<i>ágraṇītim</i>	//
LP	wind:NOM.PL.M	drink:AOR.SBJV.3PL	first.offering:ACC.SG.F	
<i>vyántu</i>	<i>ín</i>	<i>nú</i>	<i>yéṣu</i>	<i>mandasānás</i>
pursue:IMP.3PL	PRT	now	REL:LOC.PL.M	exhilarated:NOM.SG.M
<i>tṛpát</i>	<i>sómam</i>	<i>pāhi</i>	<i>drahyád</i>	<i>indra</i>
to.satisfaction	soma:ACC.SG.M	drink:AOR.IMP.2SG	strongly	Indra:VOC.SG.M

‘The Winds (will) drink the first offering.

15. Now let **just** those (soma juices) pursue you—those among whom (you) are becoming exhilarated. Steadfastly drink our soma to your satisfaction, Indra.’⁵¹⁹ RV 2.11.14d–15b

A central problem here is that it is not clear who the third person addressee of the imperative is. As possibilities Geldner (1951–1957: I, 289) considers the Winds or, with Sāyaṇa, the Maruts, which are mentioned in pāda b of stanza 14, but he prefers the somas, as do Renou (1955–1969: XVII, 56), Jamison & Brereton (2014: 415) and Jamison (comm.II: ad loc.). Given that the addressee are the somas, *íd* might signal that the poet already expects the somas to come to Indra but that he wants to further encourage them to do so. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 413) explain that “this Indra hymn was composed to accompany the day’s first soma-pressing, which anciently belonged especially to Indra and Vāyu, the Wind”. If this is the case, then it is to be expected that Indra will be next in line when the Wind has already had his share. Witzel & Gotō (2007: 367) have a different interpretation. They regard the Somas as the object. They do not make explicit who they assume the addressee of the imperative to be, but I assume that it is the Maruts, whom they identify with the Winds.⁵²⁰ According to their interpretation, one might say

⁵¹⁹ The translation of pāda 14d is adopted from Jamison (comm.II: ad loc.).

⁵²⁰ ‘die [...], als Winde, den ersten Reihen (des Soma) als erste vortrinken. Sie sollen (die Somasäfte) genießen, an denen du dich erfreut hast, Trink dich satt, trink tüchtig Soma, Indra!’.

that the link between pāda 14d and 15a is that in the former, the poet describes that the Maruts drink the Soma and it is this observation which causes him to want them to enjoy it.

As I showed in Section 5.4.2, there are two passages in which the imperative followed by *íd* is an *āmreḍita* and in at least one case, I assume that it is the primary function of *íd* to enhance the function of the *āmreḍita*:

(527) *pībā-pibéd* [= *pībā-piba íd*] *indra* *śūra*
 drink:IMP.2SG-drink:IMP.2SG+PRT Indra:VOC.SG.M champion:VOC.SG.M
sómam
 soma:ACC.SG.M

‘Drink and drink the soma, o Indra, our champion!’ RV 2.11.11a = 10.22.15a

Notice again that the two pādas where *íd* occurs after the *āmreḍita* are identical but the rest of the stanzas are not. As I explained in Section 5.4.2, I follow Klein’s (2003) analysis that the *āmreḍita* expresses iteration and therefore it is possible to consider *íd* to function as a slack regulator. However, it might also have the adhortative function that I assume for *íd* after imperatives. One way to solve this problem is to investigate whether *íd* in ex. (527) has the same linking function it has with other imperatives. In the following example, I give the stanza that precedes the first attestation of ex. (527):

<i>ároravīd</i>	<i>vṛ̥ṣṇo</i>	<i>asya</i>	<i>vájro</i>	/
roar:INT.IPRF.3SG	bull:GEN.SG.M	DEM:GEN.SG.M	mace:NOM.SG.M	
<i>ámānuṣam</i>	<i>yán</i>	<i>mānuṣo</i>	<i>nijūrvāt</i>	/
inhumane:ACC.SG.M	when	ally.of.humans:NOM.SG.M	LP.singe:SBJV.3SG	
<i>ní</i>	<i>māyīno</i>	<i>dānavásya</i>	<i>māyā</i>	/
LP	wily:GEN.SG.M	son.of.Dānu:GEN.SG.M	wile:ACC.PL.F	
<i>ápādayat</i>	<i>papivān</i>	<i>sutásya</i>		
go:CAUS.IPRF.3SG	drink:PTCP.PERF.ACT.NOM.SG.M	press:PPP.GEN.SG.M		

‘The mace of him, the bull, bellowed again and again when (Indra), the ally of Manu, was about to grind down (Vṛ̥tra), the enemy of Manu. He brought low the wiles of the wily son of Dānu, when he had drunk of the pressed soma.’ RV 2.11.10

This stanza describes a heroic deed performed by Indra before which he consumed soma. As a result, it is plausible to assume that this stanza provides a reason for Indra to heed the poet’s request of the next stanza and come to consume Soma again. This assumption is corroborated in particular by pāda d of stanza 11, where the poet makes explicit that consuming soma has helped Indra to perform his heroic deeds:

(528) *itthá* *sutáḥ* *paurá* *índram*
 thus press:PPP.NOM.SG.M Paura:LOC.SG.M Indra:ACC.SG.M
āva
 help:PERF.3SG

‘When properly pressed among the Paura, (the soma) has helped Indra.’ RV 2.11.11d

As a result, the first attestation of ex. (527) is in accordance with the other imperatives followed by *íd*. The situation is different in the second attestation, the preceding context of which I give here:

(529) <i>ahastā́</i> handless:NOM.SG.F	<i>yád</i> when	<i>apádī</i> footless:NOM.SG.F	<i>várdhata</i> grow:INJ.MID.3SG
<i>kṣā́ḥ</i> earth:NOM.SG.F	/	<i>śácībhir</i> power:INS.PL.F	<i>vediyā́nām</i> wise.way:GEN.PL.F
<i>śúṣṇam</i> Śuṣṇa:ACC.SG.M	<i>pári</i> LP	<i>pradakṣiṇíd</i> left.to.right	/
<i>śísṇathaḥ</i> jab:AOR.INJ.2SG		<i>viśvā́yave</i> whole.of.life:DAT.SG.N	<i>ní</i> LP

‘While, handless and footless, the earth grew strong through the powers of her wise ways, you, circling him with respectful circumambulation [=as if for the animal sacrifice], jabbed down Śuṣṇa for the whole of life.’ RV 10.22.14

Here, again, a heroic deed by Indra is described. However, no direct reference to soma is made here and it does not seem to me that this stanza is really intended to be an argument to convince Indra to come and drink soma. Hence, I consider the linking function of *íd* to be absent in this hymn. In order to explain this difference between the two identical pādas in ex. (527) one may assume that in the first instance it is used with adhortative function like the other instances of *íd* after imperatives. In contrast, the second instance of *íd* functions as a slack regulator, emphasizing the quantificational function of the iterative āmreḍita. Nevertheless, my observations may be distorted by the fact that 10.22.15a, i.e. a passage from a younger portion of the Rigveda, is a repetition of RV 2.11.11a, which is part of the old family books, and therefore *íd* does not occur in its “natural” context.

In addition to subjunctives and imperatives, *íd* is attested 10 times with optatives. Among these instances, there are different uses of the optative (see Delbrück 1888: 330–352, Tichy 2002: 194–198), which are accompanied by different functions of *íd*. The first type is the optative in the consequent of a conditional clause, as the following one:

(530) <i>yád</i> if	<i>īśīyāmī́tānām</i> be.master:OPT.MID.1SG+immortal:GEN.PL.M	/	<i>utá</i> and	<i>vā</i> or
<i>mártiyā́nām</i> mortal:GEN.PL.M	/	<i>jī́ved</i> live:OPT.3SG	<i>ín</i> PRT	<i>maghāvā</i> bountiful:NOM.SG.M
				<i>máma</i> 1SG.GEN

‘If I could be the master of immortals or of mortals, my bounteous patron would still live.’ RV 10.33.8

Conditionals like this, in which the predicates of both clauses are in the optative, express irrealis (Renou 1952: 390f.). As for *íd*, I assume its function to be parallel to that it has with subjunctives in the consequent of a conditional as in ex. (520). It expresses the speaker’s certainty that the

truth of the consequent follows from the truth of the antecedent. This becomes clear in a passage like ex. (530). It is important that one's bounteous patron stay alive, so that there would be no reason for the speaker not to keep his patron alive if he had the power to do so. This function of the optative is also attested without a preceding conditional clause, as the following example shows:

(531) <i>utá</i>	<i>bruvantu</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>nído</i>	/	<i>nír</i>	<i>anyátaś</i>	<i>cid</i>
and	say:IMP.3PL	1PL.DAT	scorner:NOM.PL.F		LP	from.another	PRT
<i>ārata</i>	/	<i>dádhānā</i>			<i>índra</i>	<i>íd</i>	
move:AOR.2PL		put:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.PL.M			Indra:LOC.SG.M	PRT	
<i>dúvah</i>	//	<i>utá</i>	<i>naḥ</i>		<i>subhágāṃ</i>		
reverence:ACC.SG.N		and	1PL.DAT		good.portion:ACC.PL.M		
<i>arír</i>	/	<i>vocéyur</i>			<i>dasma</i>		
stranger:NOM.SG.M		say:AOR.OPT.3PL			wondrous:VOC.SG.M		
<i>kṛṣṭáyah</i>	/	<i>syáméd [= syāma íd]</i>			<i>índrasya</i>		
people:NOM.PL.F		be:OPT.1PL+PRT			Indra:GEN.SG.M		
<i>śármaṇi</i>							
shelter:LOC.SG.N							

‘5. And let scorners say to us, “You have missed out on the rest in placing your friendship in Indra alone.”’

6. But (even) a stranger—(indeed all) the separate peoples—would say we have a good portion, o wondrous one. (For) we would be in the protection of Indra **alone**.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 93)

‘... (For) we would **certainly** be in the protection of Indra.’ (my adaptation) RV 1.4.5–6 Jamison & Brereton (2014: 93) interpret *íd* as an exclusive particle the focus of which is *índrasya* ‘of Indra’, but I do not find this interpretation convincing. In stanza 6, the poet wants to express that it is advantageous to praise only Indra but in the interpretation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 93), it is all protectors apart from Indra that are explicitly excluded. This would actually mean that the poet and his associates have less protection than otherwise. Hence, praising only Indra would actually be portrayed as a disadvantage. However, as pādas 6a/b show, the poet wants to convey that by praising Indra alone they will obtain enough protection. Instead, I assume that in pāda c he supports his assumption that there is enough protection by saying that his behavior ensures the protection of mighty Indra. This interpretation suggests that *íd* is to be construed with the preceding verb. Optatives may also express wishes, as in the following examples:

(532) <i>vṛjyāma</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>pári</i>	<i>dvíṣo</i>	/	<i>áram</i>	<i>te</i>
bend:AOR.OPT.1PL	2SG.GEN	LP	hate:ACC.PL.F		fit	2SG.DAT
<i>śakra</i>	<i>dāvāne</i>	/	<i>gaméméd [= gaméma íd]</i>		<i>indra</i>	
able:VOC.SG.M	give:INF.DAT.SG		go:AOR.OPT.1PL+PRT		Indra:VOC.SG.M	

gómataḥ
with.cows:ACC.PL.M

‘May we avoid your hatred (and be) fit for you to give to, able one. May we go to (prizes) consisting of cattle, Indra—’ RV 8.45.10

(533) *pári* *no* *vṛṇajann* *aghá* /
LP 1PL.ACC bend:SBJV.3PL evil:NOM.PL.N

durgāṇi *rathíyo* *yathā* /
difficult.to.pass:ACC.PL.N charioteer:NOM.PL.M like

syámed [= *syáma íd*] *índrasya* *śármaṇi* / *ādityánām*
be:OPT.1PL+PRT Indra:GEN.SG.M shelter:LOC.SG.N Āditya:GEN.PL.M

utāvasi
and+help:LOC.SG.N

‘Evils will avoid us, as charioteers avoid hard places. Might we be in the shelter of Indra and the help of the Ādityas.’ RV 8.47.5a–d

It is well possible that *íd* emphasizes the urgency of the wish. It might be used to emphasize that the poet and his associates truly want their wishes to be fulfilled, so that an optative with *íd* as in these two examples may be paraphrased as ‘We wish with all our hearts that ...’. However, this is not certainly deducible from the contexts. What the contexts do show, however, is that there is again a relation between the clause containing *íd* and the previous claus(es). In ex. (532), the realization of the wish in pāda c appears to be a consequence of the realization of the wishes in pādas a/b: If we avoid Indra’s hate and are fit recipients of his largesse, we will receive cattle. In ex. (533), the relation between pādas a/b and c/d is conspicuous. The predicate in pāda a is in the subjunctive, which means that the poet already expects himself and his associates to be safe. Only afterwards does he utter the wish that Indra and the Ādityas shelter them. Perhaps this order indicates that he trusts Indra and the Ādityas, but nevertheless he utters his wish to make sure that they heed his request for shelter. A special relation between the clause containing an optative followed by *íd* and the preceding context can be seen in the following example:

(534) *vocéméd* [= *vocéma íd*] *índram* *maghāvānam*
speak:AOR.OPT.1PL+PRT Indra:ACC.SG.M bountiful:ACC.SG.M

enam
DEM:ACC.SG.M

‘We would proclaim him, **just** him: Indra the bounteous’ RV 7.28.5a = 7.29.5a = 7.30.5a
This is the first pāda of a stanza that is repeated at the end of three subsequent hymns dedicated to Indra, which means that the stanza is a refrain (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 917). Accordingly,

íd establishes a link not only to the preceding clause or clauses but to the entire preceding hymn.⁵²¹

In the majority of cases where *íd* follows a finite verb, the verb is in the indicative. This constellation occurs 26 times in the Rigveda. Varma (2006: 105–107) observes that one of the functions of the particle *hii* in Hindi is to express verum focus, i.e. the affirmation of the truth of a clause (see Lohenstein 2016). Hence, one may assume that Vedic *íd* has a similar function. Varma (2006: 105f.) gives the following example for *hii* expressing verum focus:

(535) *mAI* *socatii* *hUU* *flat* *le* ***hii*** *lUU*.
 I think:IPFV.F be:AUX.1SG flat take hii LV:SBJV.PRS.1SG

‘I think I **WILL** take the flat.’

He explains that “[i]n this sentence the new information is the positive polarity of the sentence, that she will take the flat rather than not. The alternatives consist only of the opposite, that she will not, and this alternative is excluded”. As for Rigvedic *íd*, I do not find this function. Consider for instance the following example, which consists of the first three pādas of a hymn to Agni:

(536) *imám* *ū* *śú* *vo* *átithim*
 DEM:ACC.SG.M PRT PRT 2PL.GEN guest:ACC.SG.M
uśarbúdham / *viśvāsām* *viśām* *pátim*
 waking.at.dawn:ACC.SG.M all:GEN.PL.F clan:GEN.PL.F lord:ACC.SG.M
rñjase *girá* /
 stretch:MID.1SG hymn:INS.SG.F
vétíd [= véti íd] *divó* *janúśā* *kác*
 pursue:3SG+PRT heaven:ABL.SG.M birth:INS.SG.N what:ACC.SG.N
cid *á* *śúcir*
 PRT LP shiny:NOM.SG.M

‘This guest of yours here, waking at dawn, lord of all clans will I stretch toward with my hymn. He, ablaze right from his birth, pursues any (food) whatever from heaven here.’
 RV 6.15.1a–c

Varma (2006: 106) remarks that *hii* can only express verum focus when a proposition with the opposite truth value has been mentioned or can be inferred from the previous discourse. This is not the case in ex. (536), which constitutes the beginning of a hymn, and I do not find this use with other indicatives either. As a result, I assume that *íd* does not express verum focus but that it is an *emphasizer*, a function that I also found with nominal predicates and predicate nouns in Section 5.7. This means that *íd* emphasizes the truth value of the proposition but unlike the

⁵²¹ The preceding hemistich is about Varuṇa so that Jamison (comm.VII: ad loc.) surmises that it is actually not the preceding sentence with which there is a strong connection. Instead, there is a connection with the part of the hymn that precedes stanza 4.

verum focus interpretation that Varma finds for *hii*, it does not express a contrast of the proposition's truth value with the opposite truth value. Tichy (1995b: 331) observes such a function for *íd* too, but she does not distinguish between different moods.⁵²² As in Section 5.7, this is also in accordance with the affirmative function that Monier-Williams (1899: 165) assigns to *íd* and the translation 'indeed, really' that RIVELEX (II, 157) gives. This function can be observed in ex. (536). There, the object is a free-choice quantifier, which means that there is no restriction regarding the kinds of food that Agni pursues. Pāda c therefore describes an astounding fact which is hard to believe. Hence, the poet emphasizes the truth of this proposition.

As with the other moods discussed thus far, the clause containing a finite verb followed by *íd* often has a certain relation to the previous claus(es). Again, these relations may be quite different in nature. Compare the following two passages. In the first one, there is narrow focus on the verb, i.e. it is contrasted with the verb of the previous clause; in the second one, the same verb form that is followed by *íd* occurs as the predicate in the preceding stanza:

(537) <i>ná</i>	<i>dūdhíye</i>	<i>ánu</i>	<i>dadāsi</i>	<i>vāmám</i>	/
NEG	malevolent:DAT.SG.M	LP	give:2SG	valuable:ACC.SG.N	
<i>bṛhaspate</i>	<i>cáyasa</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>piyārum</i>		
Bṛhaspati:VOC.SG.M	punish:MID:2SG	PRT	mocking:ACC.SG.M		

'to the evil-minded one you do not concede anything of value; you **just** punish the reviler, Bṛhaspati.' RV 1.190.5cd

(538) <i>véši</i>	<i>hí</i>	<i>adhvarīyatām</i>	/
pursue:2SG	for	perform.ceremony:PTCP.PRS.ACT.GEN.PL.M	
<i>havyā</i>	<i>ca</i>	<i>mānuṣāṇām</i>	/ <i>upavaktā</i>
oblation:ACC.PL.N	and	son.of.Manu:GEN.PL.M	Upavaktar:NOM.SG.M
<i>jānānām</i>	//	<i>véṣīd [véši íd]</i>	<i>u asya</i>
man:GEN.PL.M		pursue:2SG+PRT	PRT DEM:GEN.SG.M
<i>dūtīyaṃ</i>	/	<i>havyām</i>	<i>mārtasya vólhave</i> /
embassy:ACC.SG.N		oblation:ACC.SG.N	mortal:GEN.SG.M pull:INF.DAT.SG
<i>yásya</i>	<i>jújoṣo</i>	<i>adhvarám</i>	
REL:GEN.SG.M	enjoy:PERF.SBJV.2SG	ceremony:ACC.SG.M	

'5. You pursue (your ritual duty) as Upavaktar for the people who perform the ceremony, and you pursue the oblations of the sons of Manu.

6. And you **also** pursue the (ritual) mission of him whose ceremony you will enjoy—to convey the oblation of the mortal.' RV 4.9.5f.⁵²³

These observations are in accordance with the emphasizing function of *íd* that I assume. In ex. (537), the contrast between the two pādas is enhanced because not only is the predicate

⁵²² Cf. also Lühr's (2009: 178–182) general assumptions about stressed particles in Vedic.

⁵²³ In the Rigvedic text from Aufrecht (1955: I, 284), pādas b and c are in reverse order in both stanzas.

describing mildness negated in pāda a, but the truth of the predicate describing rigor is emphasized. In ex. (538), one may argue that *íd* emphasizes that not only is the first conjunct in stanza 5 true but also the second one in stanza 6. Although *íd* is not an additive particle here, the translation as ‘also’ by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 572) captures this effect. Notice that *íd* is followed by *u* here, which conjoins the two stanzas (cf. Klein 1978b: 148). Klein (1978b: 11) claims that in the sequence *íd u*, the former particle does not have any function apart from avoiding hiatus. However, as I have argued in the previous sections, even though such purposes can influence the use of *íd*, it is a mistake to conclude that it is deprived of function (cf. also Dunkel 1997b: 166f.). On *íd u* see especially Section 5.2.

In addition to the moods discussed thus far, *íd* occurs 4 times with verbs in the injunctive. I will exemplify its use by the following passage:

(539) *tarāṇim vo jánānām / tradám vājasya gómataḥ / samānām u prá śamsiṣam // ṛbhukṣāṇam ná vartava / ukthēsu tugriyāvṛdham / índram sóme sácā suté //*

<i>yáḥ</i>	<i>krntád</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>ví</i>	<i>yoniyám</i>	/
REL:NOM.SG.M	cleft:INJ.3SG	PRT	LP	womblike:ACC.SG.M	
<i>triśókāya</i>	<i>girím</i>	<i>prthúm</i>	/	<i>góbhyo</i>	
Triśoka:DAT.SG.M	mountain:ACC.SG.M	wide:ACC.SG.M		cow:DAT.PL.F	
<i>gātúm</i>	<i>níretave</i>				
way:ACC.SG.M	LP.go:INF.DAT.SG				

‘28. I laud him to you as the surpassing one, as driller of the bovine prize for the peoples, and as one common (to all)—

29. As the master of the Ṛbhus, not to be obstructed, as the strengthener of the son of Tugra [=Bhujyu] (do I laud him) in solemn words when the soma is pressed—Indra!

30. Who cut apart the broad, womblike mountain for Triśoka, as a way for the cows to go forth.’ RV 8.45.28–30

In this hymn, stanzas 25–30, in the last of which *íd* occurs after the finite verb, are concerned with Indra’s glorious deeds in the past (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1119). I have given only the two preceding stanzas, without glosses, for reasons of space. In stanza 30, a verb in the injunctive is employed to report the past event. I see here no difference in the usage of *íd* compared to indicatives. Cutting apart a mountain is a wondrous deed, which may be hard to believe, so that the poet emphasizes the truth of what he says. Again, *íd* also indicates a relation to the previous discourse because what is said in stanza 30 is the last of Indra’s deeds that are reported.

A special status among finite verbs is occupied the copula, because here it is not the finite verb but the predicate noun which expresses what is predicated over the subject. In Section 5.7, I presented different interpretations of Dharmakīrti’s analysis of the particle *eva* in copular

clauses in Classical Sanskrit. I argued that the analysis of *eva* after the predicate noun can be applied to *íd* as well. Consider again the example that Dharmakīrti gives for *eva* after the copula:

(540) <i>nīlam</i>	<i>sarojam</i>	<i>bhavaty</i>	<i>eva</i>
lotus:NOM.SG.N	blue:NOM.SG.N	be:3SG	PRT

‘A lotus is **surely** blue.’⁵²⁴

As is the case with Dharmakīrti’s analysis of *eva* after the predicate noun, the interpretation of his analysis of *eva* after the copula is a matter of debate as well. Gillon & Hayes (1982) and Gillon (1999) regards this example as expressing existential quantification.⁵²⁵ Hence, it means that some lotus is blue; in terms of set theory this means that the set of lotus flowers intersects with the set of blue entities. In contrast, Ganeri (1999: 103) assumes that clauses where *eva* occurs after the copula do not differ in logical form from clauses in which *eva* occurs after the predicate noun. It would be futile to further elaborate on this matter, because the Rigvedic passages where *íd* follows the copula are not exactly comparable to the type in ex. (540). One group of passages is represented by ex. (533) above. Here, the copula is in the first person plural optative *syāma* ‘might we be’. The other passages of this type are RV 1.4.6 and 8.19.35. In these cases, the subject is the first person plural and not a common noun as in the example by Dharmakīrti. In ex. (521) above and in RV 7.85.4, *íd* occurs after the subjunctive *ásad* ‘it will be’. In the latter passage, the subject is the anaphorically used demonstrative *sá*, so that there is probably no existential quantification involved. As the translations of ex. (521) show, this passage is not clear. The nominals *vibhú* ‘excellent’ and *prabhú* ‘abundant’ may be interpreted as the subject so that existential quantification is possible: ‘Something abundant and excellent is yours’. However, it is also possible that these two nominals function as predicate nouns and the subject is a null anaphora, referring to the benefit of Indra. This speaks against existential quantification. The following example involves a quantifier:

(541) <i>ásann</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>tvé</i>	<i>āhavanāni</i>	<i>bhūri</i>
be:SBJV.3PL	PRT	2SG.LOC	offering:NOM.PL.N	many:NOM.PL.N

‘There will **surely** be many offerings poured in you’ RV 7.8.5a

Since *āhavanāni* ‘offerings’ is already overtly quantified by *bhūri* ‘many’ it does not appear that *íd* expresses existential quantification in this example. In the last example, which constitutes a group of its own, the verb *bhū-* ‘be(come)’ is present instead of *as-* ‘be’:

(542) <i>yád</i>	<i>ápravītā</i>	<i>dádhate</i>	<i>ha</i>	<i>gárbham</i>	/
when	not.impregnated:NOM.PL.F	take:MID.3PL	PRT	embryo:ACC.SG.M	

⁵²⁴ The example is quoted from Ganeri (1999: 102); the glosses are mine.

⁵²⁵ Kajiyama (1973: 164) writes: “Here, some of the lotus blooms can have the attribute ‘blue’, that is, a part of the lotus bloom is connected with a part of the blue. It means neither that all the lotus bloom is blue, nor that the lotus bloom alone is blue”.

<i>sadyás</i>	<i>cij</i>	<i>jātó</i>	<i>bhāvasíd [bhāvasi íd]</i>	<i>u</i>
at.once	PRT	be.born:PPP.NOM.SG.M	become:2SG+PRT	PRT
<i>dūtáh</i>				
messenger:NOM.SG.M				

‘when (your mothers, though) not impregnated, conceive an embryo, and you, even immediately at birth, become a messenger.’ RV 4.7.9cd

In contrast to the passages discussed before, not only is another copula verb used but it is also in the indicative. Nevertheless, since the subject is the second person singular, pāda d clearly cannot exhibit existential quantification, so that it too is not comparable to Dharmakīrti’s example.

Considering all the examples in which *íd* follows the copula, there does not seem to be a difference from those in which it follows the predicate noun, or nominal predicate, and which do not allow for a reading involving universal quantification. This indicates that Ganeri’s (1999) assumptions for *eva* after the copula appear to be more adequate than the interpretation by Gillon & Hayes (1982). However, one has to bear in mind that the Rigvedic examples with *íd* are not exactly comparable to Dharmakīrti’s example for *eva*. For the latter is a copular clause in which both subject and predicate noun are a common noun and therefore allows for an interpretation involving existential quantification. In contrast, the Rigvedic examples must or at least can be interpreted in a way that does not allow for existential quantification. As a result, I have to leave the question regarding the difference in meaning between clauses in which *íd* follows the predicate noun and those in which it follows the copula unanswered.

In this section, I have argued that *íd* can be employed to express epistemic modality and function as an emphaser when it occurs after nominal predicates or predicate nouns and after finite verbs. This is similar to the function that Koziánka (2000: 225) assigns to *íd*, namely to mark something as evident and irrevocable (“<EVIDENT, UNABÄNDERLICH>”), even though she gives this as a general function and not as one that occurs only after predicates. However, further distinction is necessary here. Following Boye (2012: 2), there is a distinction between epistemic modality, which concerns the speaker’s certainty about the truth of a proposition, and evidentiality, which concerns the evidence that the speaker has for the truth of a proposition, even though both are subcategories of epistemicity.⁵²⁶ Thus, in the examples where *íd* functions as an emphaser it does not seem to mark that the speaker has specific evidence for the truth of the respective proposition. However, emphasizing the truth of a

⁵²⁶ Notice, however, that there is disagreement in the literature on this matter. See Boye (2012: 1–3) for an overview and references.

proposition or expressing certainty may imply that the proposition is irrevocable so that assuming such a feature for *íd* is justifiable.

In this section, I have investigated the functions of *íd* after finite verbs. I have argued that with subjunctives it expresses epistemic modality, i.e. it indicates the speaker's certainty about the truth of the proposition (exx. (520), (521)). I have found the same function for optatives in the main clause of conditionals (ex. (530)), although a dependent conditional clause need not be present (ex. (531)). For optatives expressing wishes, I surmise that *íd* indicates the urgency of the wish (ex. (532), (533)). I have not been able to determine the exact value of *íd* after imperatives (exx. (523)–(525)) but I surmise that it is adhortative and similar to the function of the particles *tú* or *sú*. I have found no difference in the function of *íd* after indicatives and injunctives. In both cases, I consider *íd* to function as an emphasizer. For almost all cases in which *íd* follows a finite verb, I have confirmed the observation by Boley (2004) and Viti (2007) that *íd* signals a link between the clause in which it occurs and the previous discourse. As the various examples have shown, both the nature of the link and the size of the previous discourse to which it relates its clause may vary.

5.9 *íd* after local particles

This section is closely related to the previous one. It is dedicated to those passages in which *íd* follows a local particle and I will argue for the correctness of the view that *íd* in this position is mostly equivalent to the cases in which it occurs after a finite verb. This is not only reflected in its functions but also in its ability to cause local particles that otherwise would be unaccented to bear an accent. At the end of this section, I will discuss the sequence *á íd*, which in younger Vedic is by some authors considered to have a specialized meaning. I will argue that there is only one passage in which *á* should not be analyzed as a local particle but as emphatic.

Following Reinöhl & Casaretto (2018: 242–244), local particles constitute one group of spatial adverbs. They explain that in addition to functioning as adverbs, they may also exhibit verbal or nominal orientation, which means that “they semantically modify, and syntactically combine with, a verb or a local case form”. A local particle can occur in adnominal position, i.e. adjacent to the noun, or in adverbial position, i.e. at the beginning of a clause or directly before the verb, but the syntax is not necessarily indicative of its semantic orientation (Hettrich et al. 2004 [2010]: 19f.). For a detailed overview of local particles see Hettrich et al. (2004

[2010]: 17–35). On their grammatical status in Rigvedic Sanskrit see Casaretto & Schneider (2015). The Rigveda contains 48 instances of *íd* following a local particle.⁵²⁷

Regarding the function of *íd* after local particles, it should be expected that it is equivalent to that which is seen after finite verbs. According to Grassmann (1873: 206), *íd* occurs after finite verbs when the verb does not co-occur with a local particle (cf. also Geldner 1907–1909: I, 28 Boling 1972: 81, Tichy 1995b: 331). Consider the following passage:

(543) <i>sóma</i>		<i>íd</i>	<i>vaḥ</i>	<i>sutó</i>		<i>astu</i>	/
soma:NOM.SG.M		PRT	2PL.GEN	press:PPP.NOM.SG.M		be:IMP.3SG	
<i>kálayo</i>	<i>má</i>	<i>bibhūta</i>	/	<i>ápéd [= ápa íd]</i>		<i>eṣá</i>	
Kali:VOC.PL.M	NEG	fear:PERF.INJ.2PL		LP+PRT		DEM:NOM.SG.M	
<i>dhvasmāyati</i>							
miasma:NOM.SG.M+go:SBJV.3SG							

‘Let just your soma be pressed. Kalis, stop fearing: this miasma will go away’ RV 8.66.15a–c

The overall pattern that can be observed in this passage is highly reminiscent of patterns that I have shown in examples in Section 5.8: Regarding this stanza Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1154) explain that “[i]t reassures an otherwise unknown group of people, the Kalis, that if they press soma, whatever is threatening them will disappear”. Pādas a and b each express an order. Pāda c, whose predicate is a subjunctive that expresses expectation, describes what happens if the order is heeded. I therefore assume that as in exx. (520) and (521) in Section 5.8, *íd* expresses epistemic modality, i.e. it marks the speaker’s certainty, and indicates a close connection with the previous clauses. Accordingly, I assume that *íd* following a local particle has the same function as when it follows a finite verb. Notice, however, that Grassmann’s (1873: 206) rule is not entirely accurate. In Section 5.8.1, I showed that in the three passages that exhibit an unaccented verb followed by *íd*, the verb is preceded by a local particle. Likewise, in ex. (515), where *íd* follows an accented verb, the local particle *úpa* is present. This means that *íd* does not always occur after the local particle if one is present.⁵²⁸

Yet, that the function of *íd* after finite verbs apparently equals that after local particles is also observable when the verb is in the imperative, as the following example shows:

(544) <i>yó</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>āgo</i>	<i>abhí</i>	<i>éno</i>
REL:NOM.SG.M	1PL.DAT	sin:ACC.SG.N	LP	blame:ACC.SG.N

⁵²⁷ Among these, there are 4 instances in which the particle *gha* occurs between the local particle and *íd* (RV 1.53.7; 2.34.14; 8.2.33; 8.93.1) and one in which the enclitic *sīm* (RV 3.38.3) occurs between them; on the former group see Hejib (1984: 228–232). The number also includes ex. (559) below, where *ā* is probably emphatic rather than a local particle. Not included in this number is RV 7.4.8, where *íd* occurs after *púnar* ‘again’, but I agree with Grassmann (1873: 822) that its use is comparable to a local particle here.

⁵²⁸ Grassmann (1873: 206) himself gives ex. (511) as an exception to the rule.

bhārāti / *ádhīd* [= *ádhi íd*] *aghám*
 carry:SBJV.3SG LP+PRT evil:ACC.SG.N

aghásamse *dadhāta*
 evil-speaking:LOC.SG.M put:IMP.2PL

‘Whoever will bring offense or blame against us—set evil upon him, the speaker of evil.’⁵²⁹ RV 5.3.7ab

The relation between the two clauses is fairly clear. The relative clause in pādas a/b expresses a condition and can be paraphrased as ‘If a man should turn upon us sin or guilt’ (Oldenberg 1897: 372). As a consequence of this condition, the poet wants this man to be punished. I consider *íd* to have the same adhortative function that it has immediately after imperatives, the exact nature of which I have been unable to determine. The following example I have already discussed in Section 5.7, but it is useful to mention it again in light of the functions of *íd* after local particles:

(545) *revām* *íd* *revāta* *stotā* / *syāt*
 rich:NOM.SG.M PRT rich:GEN.SG.M praiser:NOM.SG.M be:OPT.3SG
tuvāvato *maghónaḥ* / *préd* [= *prá íd*] *u*
 like.you:GEN.SG.M bountiful:GEN.SG.M LP+PRT PRT
harivaḥ *śrutāsya*
 with.bay.horses:VOC.SG.M hear:PPP.GEN.SG.M

‘Rich **indeed** should be the praiser of a rich benefactor like you, and far(-famed) **indeed** (the praiser) of a famous one, o possessor of the fallow bays.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1027)

‘**Every** praiser of a rich benefactor like you should be rich and, far(-famed **every** praiser) of a famous one, o possessor of the fallow bays.’ (my adaptation) RV 8.2.13

As I have outlined, *íd* after the predicate noun in the first clause possibly yields a reading comparable to universal quantification of the subject but also the reading as an emphasizer (perhaps emphasizing the urgency of the wish) is possible and perhaps both nuances are conveyed by the employment of *íd*. In the second clause, *íd* occurs after the local particle; the finite verb, which is identical to the copula in the first clause is omitted, as well as the subject. Hence, I assume that *íd* has the same reading after the local particle as it has after the predicate noun before. In the following example, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1407) claim that *íd* is used pleonastically, but I consider it to have its usual function after local particles:

(546) *índraḥ* *śmáśrūṇi* *hāritābhí* *pruṣṇute* /
 Indra:NOM.SG.M beard:ACC.PL.N tawny:ACC.PL.N+LP sprinkle:MID.3SG
áva *veti* *sukśáyam* *suté*
 LP pursue:3SG with.lovely.dwelling:ACC.SG.N press:PPP.LOC.SG.M

⁵²⁹ The translation deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014).

<i>mádhu</i>	/	<i>úd</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>dhūnoti</i>	<i>váto</i>	<i>yáthā</i>
honey:ACC.SG.N		LP	PRT	toss:3SG	wind:NOM.SG.M	like
<i>vánam</i>						
tree:ACC.SG.N						

‘Indra sprinkles his tawny beard. He pursues his track down to the honey having its lovely dwelling in the pressed soma. He tosses (his beard) upward like the wind a tree.’ RV 10.23.4b–d

In this example, one can assume that the tossing of the beard described in pāda d is a consequence of sprinkling it, which is described in pāda b. Hence, even though it is not the immediately preceding clause that has the closest connection with the clause containing *íd*, it is plausible to assume that *íd* marks a close connection with the previous context. Moreover, as Indra is a mighty god with impressive physical strength it is also possible that the poet is amazed by the way he tosses his beard and he expresses this by using *íd* to emphasize the truth of the proposition. This function of *íd* after local particles is also observed by Tichy (1995b: 331). As a result, I do not regard *íd* as pleonastic here but I assume that it has the function that is observable after other local particles and finite verbs in other passages. There are, however, cases the general interpretation of which is difficult, so that it is also difficult to determine the link between the clause with *íd* and the preceding contexts. One such case is the following example, which is dedicated to Indra:

(547) <i>yásmín</i>	<i>víśvās</i>	<i>carṣaṇáya</i>	/	<i>utá</i>	<i>cyautná</i>
REL:LOC.SG.M	all:NOM.PL.F	people:NOM.PL.F		and	exploit:NOM.PL.N
<i>jráyāmsi</i>	<i>ca</i>	/	<i>ánu</i>	<i>ghén [= gha íd]</i>	<i>mandī</i>
expanse:NOM.PL.N	and	LP	PRT+PRT		delighting:NOM.SG.M
<i>maghónaḥ</i>					
bountiful:ACC.PL.M					

‘In whom are all the settled domains and both exploits and expanses. The (soma) invigorating for the bounteous (Indra) (follows) along.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1028)

‘... When he is exhilarated, he does as the generous patrons do’⁵³⁰

‘... The rejoicer [= soma] comes **only** to the generous.’ (Hejib 1984: 196) RV 8.2.33

In this example, *íd* follows the local particle *ánu* and the finite verb is omitted. Nevertheless, *ánu* does not assume an adnominal position, because it is followed by the nominative *mandī* ‘exhilarating’, with which it is probably not to be construed. A comparison of the translations in ex. (547) shows that it is difficult to identify the relation between the clause in pāda c and the previous one because different interpretations of pāda c are possible. Geldner (1951–1957: II, 284) considers the subject to be Indra and regards *maghónas* as an accusative plural referring

⁵³⁰ The translation follows Geldner (1951–1957: II, 284): ‘Wenn er berauscht ist, so tut er es den freigebigen Herren gleich’.

to the patrons. In contrast, Jamison (comm.VIII.1: ad loc.) explains that she assumes soma to be the subject and *maghónas* to be a genitive singular referring to Indra. Yet differently, Hejib (1984: 196f.) regards *maghónas* as the goal of a motion.⁵³¹ With respect to the relationship of pādas a/b and c, he observes that the latter “suddenly breaks the continuity with” the preceding hemistich. I do not agree with his interpretation of *íd* as exclusive.

An obvious counterexample to the observation that *íd* after a local particle marks a close relationship with the preceding clauses is the following one, which I already discussed in Section 5.4.2:

(548) <i>sám-sam</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>yuvase</i>	<i>vṛṣann</i>	/	<i>ágne</i>
LP-LP	PRT	separate:MID.2SG	bull:VOC.SG.M		Agni:VOC.SG.M
<i>víśvāni</i>	<i>aryá</i>		<i>á</i>		
all:ACC.PL.N	stranger:ABL.SG.M		LP		

‘Over and over, o Agni, you bull, you wrest together all things from the stranger.’ RV 10.191.1ab

Here, the local particle is the first word of the hymn. This example is special in that the local particle is an *āmreḍita*, so that *íd* may be primarily employed to emphasize its function. However, as mentioned in Section 5.4.2, I am not certain about the exact function of the *āmreḍita* either.

In the beginning of this section, I mentioned that local particles have three different functions, namely being an adverb, modifying verbs and modifying nominals. If the function of *íd* after local particles is to be regarded as equivalent to the one after finite verbs, one should not expect it to occur after those that modify nominals. Determining the orientation of a local particle is not an easy task and it cannot be provided in all cases. In the beginning of this section, I also mentioned that the position of a local particle is not necessarily indicative of its orientation. Nevertheless, based on Hettrich et al. (2004 [2010]: 45), Reinöhl & Casaretto (2018: 245–249) find that the position of the local particle may be used as a formal criterion for its orientation, at least as a tendency: If it occurs adjacent to a nominal, this points to nominal orientation; adjacency to a verb points to verbal orientation; initial position in the clause or pāda also points to verbal orientation.⁵³² Indeed, I find no clear example of adnominal local particles followed by *íd*.⁵³³ However, I find cases which according to the pattern specified by Hettrich et al. (2004 [2010]: 45) are characterized as ambiguous:

(549) <i>ulūkhalasutānām</i>	/	<i>ávéd [= áva íd]</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>indra</i>
mortar.pressed:GEN.PL.M		LP+PRT	PRT	Indra:VOC.SG.M

⁵³¹ RIVELEX (I, 213) supplies the verb *as-*, so that they translate the predicate as ‘be ready, be favourable’

⁵³² Intervening particles like *íd* are to be disregarded with respect to adjacency to a noun or verb.

⁵³³ In ex. (559) below, *á* occurs in adnominal position, but it is probably emphatic rather than a local particle.

jalgulaḥ

devour:INT.SBJV.2SG

‘you, Indra, will keep gulping down the mortar-pressed (soma drops).’ RV 1.28.1cd

In this clause, which is repeated in stanzas 2–4 of this hymn, the local particle *áva* immediately follows the nominal *ulúkhelasutānām* ‘pressed by a mortar’ and does not immediately precede the finite verb, which indicates nominal orientation. However, *áva* also occupies the first position of pāda d, which points to verbal orientation and therefore renders this passage ambiguous. As ambiguous I regard also cases like ex. (545) above, where the finite verb is omitted but the local particle does not occur in adnominal position. There is one example in which the local particle *prāti* has been considered to appear in clause and pāda-internal as well as prenominal position, which points to nominal orientation. However, a clause boundary before the local particle probably has to be assumed, which renders this passage ambiguous:

(550) <i>sá</i>	<i>vṛtrahā</i>	<i>prāti</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>anyám</i>
DEM:NOM.SG.M	Vṛtra.smasher:NOM.SG.M	LP	PRT	other:ACC.SG.M

āhuḥ
say:PERF.3PL

‘‘That’s the Vṛtra-smiter!’’ they respond to the other.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1202)

‘The Vṛtra-smiter measures up to (every) other one, so they say’⁵³⁴ RV 8.96.19d

Whereas in his commentary Geldner (1907–1909: II, 135) states that there is a clause boundary before *prāti*, in his translation he (1951–1957: II, 423) follows Sāyaṇa and instead assumes a clause boundary before *āhus* ‘they say’. However, the latter view is explicitly rejected by Ludwig (1876–1888: V, 189) and Jamison (comm.VIII.2: ad loc.) and the former is also assumed by Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 514), Hopkins (1907: 381) and Oldenberg (1909–1912: II, 147) and Velankar (1947–1948: 14). I also reject the view that there is a clause boundary before *āhus*, especially because Jamison (comm.VIII.2: ad loc.) correctly remarks that the verb should be accented when it occurs after a clause boundary. As a result, I regard this as a case where *prāti* occurs before a noun but also in the first position of the clause and is therefore ambiguous. In contrast to the previous two examples, there are cases like ex. (546) above, where the local particle clearly does not occur in adnominal position. There, the local particle *úd úd* occurs in the first position of both the clause and the pāda and immediately precedes the finite verb *dhūnoti* ‘he tosses’. Since I find no clear case of *íd* after a local particle with nominal orientation but I do find cases in which it clearly is not nominally oriented, I conclude that *íd* only occurs after local particles that are verbally oriented or function as adverbs. Works on local

⁵³⁴ The translation follows Geldner (1951–1957: II, 423): ‘der Vṛtratöter ist (jedem) anderen gewachsen, so sagen sie’.

particles in the Rigveda (e.g. Casaretto 2011 [2012]: 166–175 among several others) have shown that the difference between the latter two groups is gradient and the distinction has to be made by semantic in addition to syntactic criteria. I will not discuss this matter further here.

One example that is noteworthy is the following passage. Here, *íd* occurs after the relative pronoun in the subclause and also after a local particle in the main clause:

(551) <i>devánāṃ</i>	<i>yá</i>	<i>ín</i>	<i>máno</i>	/
god:GEN.PL.M	REL:NOM.SG.M	PRT	mind:ACC.SG.N	
<i>yájamāna</i>		<i>íyakṣati</i>	/	<i>abhíd</i> [= <i>abhí íd</i>]
sacrifice:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M		reach:DES.3SG		LP+PRT
<i>áyajvano</i>		<i>bhuvat</i>		
non.sacrificer:ACC.PL.M		become:AOR.INJ.3SG		

‘**Just** he who, as sacrificer, seeks to attain the mind of the gods will surpass non-sacrificers.’ RV 8.31.16c–e

These three pādas are repeated as the final pādas of stanzas 17 and 18 in this hymn as well. The local particle *abhí* occurs before the nominal *áyajvanas* ‘the non-sacrificers’ but also clause-initially and its status is therefore ambiguous. Regarding the first instance of *íd*, I assume that it has scalar exclusive function and since the relative clause expresses a sufficient condition the scale it evokes is reversed. This means that the sacrificer who seeks to attain the mind of the gods occupies a high point on a scale of different sacrificers. Under the assumption that *abhí* is verbally oriented, I interpret *íd* in the main clause as a marker of epistemic modality as in ex. (543).⁵³⁵ However, I am not certain whether *íd* in the main clause takes wide scope over the one in the subclause. If this were the case, the example could be paraphrased as ‘it is certain that only the sacrificer seeking to attain the mind of the gods will surpass non-sacrificers’, i.e. nobody else will surpass them. If *íd* in the main clause took narrow scope, the example could be paraphrased as ‘only for the sacrificer seeking to attain the mind of the gods is it certain that he will surpass the non-sacrificers’, i.e. it is possible, though unlikely, for others as well.

The following passage is different from the ones I have discussed thus far. Here, the local particle followed by *íd* appears to function as a discourse marker:

(552) <i>vāvárta yéṣāṃ rāyá</i> / <i>yuktá eṣāṃ hiraṇyáyī</i> / <i>nemádhitā ná paúṃsiyā</i> / <i>vṛthā iva viṣṭántā</i>					
// <i>prá tád duḥśīme pṛthavāne vené</i> / <i>prá rāmé vocam ásure maghávatsu</i> / <i>yé yuktváya pāñca śatá asmayú</i> / <i>pathá viśrāvi eṣāṃ</i> //					
<i>ádhín</i> [= <i>ádhi íd</i>]	<i>nú</i>	<i>átra</i>	<i>saptatīm</i>	<i>ca</i>	<i>saptá</i>
LP+PRT	now	here	seventy:ACC.SG.F	and	seven
<i>ca</i> /	<i>sadyó</i>	<i>didiṣṭa</i>	<i>tānuvaḥ</i>	/	<i>sadyó</i>
and	at.once	assign:INJ.MID.3SG	Tānva:NOM.SG.M		at.once

⁵³⁵ On the use of the injunctive in this context see Hoffmann (1967: 238f.).

didiṣṭa *pārthiyáh* / *sadyó* *didiṣṭa*
 assign:INJ.MID.3SG Pārthya:NOM.SG.M at.once assign:INJ.MID.3SG

māyaváh
 Māyava:NOM.SG.M

‘13. They whose (priestly gift) comes rolling, their (priestly gift) is golden, yoked with wealth—it is) like manly forces when facing the other side, like one whose ends have been accomplished [?] at will.

14. I proclaim this in front of Duṣṣīma, Pṛthavāna, Vena, in front of Rāma the lordly, in front of the patrons who, having yoked five hundred, (sent) them along the path, destined for us, (so that) their (priestly gift) has become widely famed.

15. In addition here and now seven and seventy at once did Tānva assign (to us), at once did Pārthya assign, at once did Māyava assign.’ RV 10.93.13–15

Following Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1544), stanzas 13–15 are a *dānastuti*, a praise of liberality, in which several patrons are named. The local particle under consideration, *ádhi*, which usually means ‘above’ occurs at the beginning of stanza 15. According to Grassmann (1873: 45), Bergaigne (1884: 47), Oldenberg (1909–1912: II, 301) and RIVELEX (I, 155), *ádhi* in pāda 15a has a connective function and can be translated as ‘in addition’ vel sim. Renou (1955–1969: IV, 129) agrees and he remarks that *ádhi* only has this function in combination with numerals, contrary to Grassmann (1873: 45), who gives more passages for this function.⁵³⁶ Hettrich (1991: 60f.) appears to analyze the local particle somewhat differently. He subsumes this case under a small group of passages where the reference point of *ádhi* should be expressed by a nominal but where this nominal is omitted.⁵³⁷ In any case, it is difficult to determine the function of *íd*, which follows *ádhi*. Under the assumption that *ádhi* functions as a discourse marker, this is the only instance which is followed by *íd* in this function, in the other two that Renou (1955–1969: IV, 129) identifies (RV 4.30.15 and 7.18.14) *ádhi* occurs alone. In ex. (552) Renou (1955–1969: V, 63) appears to construe *íd* with *átra* instead of the preceding *ádhi*, but I attempt to avoid solutions like this.⁵³⁸ Likewise, I do not know how to interpret *íd* in light of the analysis by Hettrich (1991: 60f.) either. Unfortunately, he only mentions this passage but does not explicitly discuss or translate it, so that I am not certain about his exact interpretation.

Another passage that differs from the ones discussed above is the following example. Here, *íd* occurs after a local particle but the context suggests that its function is to mark exhaustive focus rather than to emphasize the truth of the proposition:

⁵³⁶ RIVELEX gives more passages for this function than Renou too.

⁵³⁷ Bergaigne and Oldenberg group the use of *ádhi* in pāda 15a together with the use of *ádhi* in RV 4.30.15. In contrast, according to Hettrich, RV 4.30.15 is part of a similar but nonetheless different group, and he remarks a development towards a connective only for *ádhi* in this group but not for cases like ex. (552).

⁵³⁸ ‘Il y eut à cette même occasion et soixante-dix et sept en sus’.

(553) <i>índro</i> Indra:NOM.SG.M	<i>yájvane</i> sacrificing:DAT.SG.M	<i>pr̥naté</i> fill:PTCP.PRS.ACT.DAT.SG.M	<i>ca</i> and
<i>śikṣati</i> help:DES.3SG	/	<i>úpéd [úpa íd]</i> LP+PRT	<i>dadāti</i> give:3SG
<i>muṣāyati</i> steal:3SG		<i>ná</i> NEG	<i>suvám</i> property:ACC.SG.N

‘Indra does his best for the man who sacrifices and delivers in full. He gives more; he does not steal what belongs to him.’ RV 6.28.2ab

The context suggests that the main function of *íd* is here to express that Indra gives more to the sacrificer instead of stealing his belongings.⁵³⁹ This means that the entire clause is its focus and that its function is comparable to ex. (371) in Section 5.1. The difference is that in ex. (553), the alternative to the focus is mentioned in the following clause and not in the previous one.

Regarding the discussion of local particles followed by *íd*, there is also a prosodic peculiarity that has to be mentioned. In Section 5.8, I presented the rule that in Vedic main clauses the finite verb is unaccented whereas in subordinate clauses it is accented. This rule also affects local particles: When a finite verb in a subordinate clause is accented and a local particle directly precedes it, the local particle loses its accent unless it occurs in the first position of the clause or pāda (Hettrich et al. 2004 [2010]: 22). In Section 5.8.1, I illustrated the different accentuation by exx. (516) and (517). Similar to the accentuation of finite verbs, *íd* also has an influence on the accentuation of local particles. The next passage shows a subordinate clause, which means that the verb should be accented and the adjacent local particle unaccented. Yet, as Schneider (2013a: 184) remarks, the local particle in the following passage is accented because *íd* occurs between it and the accented finite verb:

(554) <i>yám</i> REL:ACC.SG.M	<i>śśānaḥ</i> be.able:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M	<i>sám</i> LP	<i>íd</i> PRT	<i>indhé</i> kindle:MID.3SG
<i>haviṣmān</i> with.offering:NOM.SG.M				

‘whom the master kindles, bringing the offering’ RV 7.1.16b

The same is the case in RV 8.45.31. I find no other cases in the Rigveda where *íd* occurs after a local particle that would otherwise be unaccented. Notice that the prosodic pattern in ex. (554) differs from the one in exx. (511)–(513) in Section 5.8.1, where *íd* follows the verb and not the adjacent local particle. In the latter group, the verb remains unaccented whereas in the former example it bears an accent.

⁵³⁹ *Svám* refers here to the possessions of the sacrificer, not of Indra (Jamison comm.VI.1: ad loc.).

As the above discussion has shown, the Rigveda exhibits clear examples of local particles that have verbal orientation which are followed by *íd*. In contrast, I have not found clear instances of nominal orientation and only one possible but unclear case of *íd* after a local particle that functions as a discourse marker. In this discussion I have excluded one local particle, namely *á*, whose basic meaning is ‘here’ and which occurs 5 times before *íd* in the Rigveda.⁵⁴⁰ The reason for excluding it is that in Vedic prose, this collocation, written as *éd* in its sandhi form, has a special status.⁵⁴¹ It is lexicalized and has been interpreted as an interjection ‘lo!’ in the literature (Gaedicke 1880: 210–213; Delbrück 1888: 184; Monier-Williams 1899: 1323; Hiersche 1976). However, Tichy (1995b: 332) rejects this view. She argues that *éd* is to be interpreted as a lexicalized collocation of the local particle *á* *íd*, which according to its origin is to be interpreted as if it occurred with the verbs *i-* ‘go’, *gam-* ‘go’ or *paś-/dṛś-* ‘see’. Gotō (2013: 152) thinks of “a real ellipsis of the verb of motion *ay/i* or *gam* after *á+íd*”.⁵⁴² Yet differently, Dunkel (2014: 209; 211) assumes that *éd* does not involve the local particle *á* but the homonymous asseverative particle and he translates it as ‘exactly like that, just like that’ (‘genau so, gerade so’). According to Tichy (1995b: 331f.), Rigvedic *íd* appears to have its usual function as an emphazier when it follows *á*, i.e. *éd* (= *á* *íd*) is not essentially different from the other cases of local particle + *íd* I have discussed in this section. Yet, due to its special status in younger Vedic, I will now re-examine the instances of *á* *íd* (*éd*) in the Rigveda in order to determine whether traces of this use can be found as early as in Rigvedic times. On *á* in the Rigveda in general see recently Casaretto (2017). I will start by determining the status of *á* in the passages in which it is followed by *íd*. In two of those passages, *á* is a local particle that does not occur in clear adnominal position (cf. RIVELEX II, 6; 10):

(555) <i>aryamáṇam</i>	<i>váruṇam</i>	<i>mítrám</i>	<i>eṣām</i>	/
Aryaman:ACC.SG.M	Varuṇa:ACC.SG.M	Mitra:ACC.SG.M	DEM:GEN.PL.M	
<i>índrāviṣṇū</i>	<i>marúto</i>	<i>aśvínotá</i>		/
Indra.Viṣṇu:ACC.DU.M	Marut:ACC.PL.M	Aśvin:ACC.DU.M+and		
<i>suásvo</i>	<i>agne</i>	<i>suráthaḥ</i>		
with.good.horses:NOM.SG.M	Agni:VOC.SG.M	with.good.chariot:NOM.SG.M		
<i>surádhā</i>	/	<i>éd</i> [= <i>á</i> <i>íd</i>]	<i>u</i>	<i>vaha</i>
with.good.gifts:NOM.SG.M		LP+PRT	PRT	pull:IMP.2SG
<i>suhaviṣe</i>	<i>jánāya</i>			
with.good.oblation:DAT.SG.M	man:DAT.SG.M			

⁵⁴⁰ These passages are, however, included in the total number of cases of *íd* after local particles that I have given in the beginning of the section.

⁵⁴¹ According to Tichy (1995b: 319), it is attested 18 times.

⁵⁴² See also Weber (1865: 249) and Eggeling (1885: xxix). See Minard (1956: 274f.) for further references. He calls *éd* a false interjection (“fausse interjection”).

‘Among those (gods), convey Aryaman, Varuṇa, Mitra, Indra and Viṣṇu, the Maruts, and the Aśvins **just** here, to the person providing good oblations, o Agni—you who have good horses, good chariot, good rewards.’ RV 4.2.4

(556) <i>śatām</i>	<i>vā</i>	<i>yáh</i>	<i>śúcīnām</i>	/	
hundred:NOM.SG.N	or	REL:NOM.SG.M	shiny:GEN.PL.M		
<i>sahásraṃ</i>	<i>vā</i>	<i>sámāśirām</i>	/	<i>éd [= á íd]</i>	<i>u</i>
thousand:NOM.SG.M	or	with.milk:GEN.PL.M		LP+PRT	PRT
<i>nimnám</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>rīyate</i>			
deep:ACC.SG.M	like	flow:MID.3SG			

‘The (soma), which is a hundred pure (draughts) or a thousand mixed with milk, flows here as if into the deep.’ RV 1.30.2

In the first example, *á* occurs with the verb *vaha* ‘convey’. It occupies the first position of the pāda and is followed by the verb. In the second example, it occurs with a verb of movement, *rīyate* ‘it flows’, too, and it occupies the first position in the pāda, which speaks against nominal orientation. It is in fact followed by the nominal *nimnám* ‘depth’, which encodes a goal, but this goal is part of the simile and therefore does not encode the goal of the matrix predicate. In one further passage *á* occurs with a verb of movement (cf. RIVELEX II, 15), but here its position is ambiguous with respect to its orientation:

(557) <i>índra</i>	<i>nédīya</i>	<i>éd [= á íd]</i>	<i>ihī</i>	/
Indra:NOM.SG.M	closer:ACC.SG.N	LP+PRT	go:IMP.2SG	
<i>mitāmedhābhir</i>	<i>ūtībhiḥ</i>			
with.secure.wisdom:INS.PL.F	help:INS.PL.F			

‘Indra, come closer here with your help that provides secure wisdom’ RV 8.53.5ab

In this passage, *á* directly precedes the imperative *ihī* ‘go’ but it also follows the adverbial accusative *nédīyas* ‘closer’, which expresses the goal. Hence, its orientation is ambiguous but it is unproblematic to interpret it as a local particle. There are two passages which formally resemble the use of *éd* in prose because no verb of movement is present. The first one is the following passage:

(558) <i>éd [= á íd]</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>mádhvo</i>	<i>madíntaram</i>	/
LP+PRT	PRT	honey:ABL.SG.N	delighting:COMP.ACC.SG.N	
<i>siñcá</i>	<i>vādhvaryo</i>	<i>ándhasaḥ</i>		
pour:IMP.2SG	or+Adhvaryu:VOC.SG.M	stalk:ABL.SG.N		

‘(Pour) **right** here what is more invigorating than honey, or pour, Adhvaryu, (what is more invigorating) than the stalk’ RV 8.24.16ab

Given that pāda a constitutes a clause of its own, it lacks a finite verb. Theoretically, *madíntaram* ‘invigorating’ could be a nominative neuter and function as a nominal predicate, but then this passage would be difficult to interpret. Jamison (comm.VIII.1: ad loc.) explains that she supplies the finite verb from the following clause. Since *sic-* ‘pour’ is a verb of

movement, this passage is then comparable to the previous ones. Geldner (1951–1957: II, 332) supplies a different verb, as well as a head of the object nominal expression, so that according to him one can translate the example as ‘(Bring the soma) here, which is more invigorating than mead, or pour from the drink, Adhvaryu’.⁵⁴³ In any case, it is a verb of movement which is supplied, so that this passage is comparable to the three previous examples. This means that there is only one passage left, namely the following one:

(559) <i>suté-sute</i>		<i>níokase</i>	/
press:PPP.LOC.SG.M-press:PPP.LOC.SG.M		domestic:DAT.SG.M	
<i>brhád</i>	<i>brhatá</i>	<i>éd [= á íd]</i>	<i>aríḥ</i> /
lofty:ACC.SG.N	lofty:DAT.SG.M	LP+PRT	stranger:NOM.SG.M
<i>índrāya</i>	<i>śūśám</i>	<i>arcati</i>	
Indra:DAT.SG.M	resounding:ACC.SG.M	sing:3SG	

‘To him who is at home at every soma-pressing, to the lofty one, the stranger **himself** chants a lofty, lusty (chant) to Indra.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 100)

‘To him who is at home at every soma-pressing, to the one who **truly** is lofty, the stranger chants a lofty, lusty (chant) to Indra (my adaptation).’ RV 1.9.10

Here, the finite verb is *arcati* ‘he sings’, which according to Grassmann (1873: 110f.) does not occur with *á*. Therefore, Jamison (comm.I.1: ad loc.) remarks that “[t]he position and function of *á* (embedded in *éd*) in b are unclear”. According to Geldner (1901: 80) and RIVELEX (II, 25), this passage does not contain an instance of the local particle *á* but an instance of the homonymous emphatic particle. As for the function of emphatic *á*, Osthoff (1879: 103–108) assumes that it was used to reinforce the meaning of the case of the preceding nominal (cf. Renou 1955–1969: II, 115). Dunkel (1997a: 12f.), who observes that emphatic *á* also occurs after other lexical classes than nouns, assigns it a function similar to *íd*. So does Casaretto (2017: 66). Dunkel (1982: 96) suggests that it is “conveyable by the use of ‘even, indeed’, or by fronting to indicate topicalisation”. RIVELEX (II, 1f.) renders it as ‘indeed’. Even though there is some agreement among the mentioned authors, the exact function of emphatic *á* does not appear to be clear, which complicates the attempt to determine the function of the combination *á íd*. In ex. (559), Renou (1955–1969: XVII, 6) and Jamison & Brereton (2014: 100) translate it as an intensifier ‘himself’.⁵⁴⁴ Thieme (1938: 11f.) translates it as the general additive particle ‘auch’, Geldner (1901: 80, 1951–1957: I, 10) and Witzel & Gotō (2007: 22) translate it as ‘even’ (‘sogar’).⁵⁴⁵ In accordance with this, Jamison (comm.I.1: ad loc.) suggests emending Jamison

⁵⁴³ ‘(Bring den Soma) her, der berauscher als Met ist, oder schenke von dem Trank ein, Adhvaryu’.

⁵⁴⁴ ‘Pressurage après pressurage, l’Étranger lui-même chante pour Indra, (dieu) familier (et) puissant, / un hymne puissant’ (Renou).

⁵⁴⁵ ‘Ihm, der zu Hause ist, wo immer Gepreßtes vorhanden, dem hohen Indra, sing auch der Fremde ein hohes Einladungslied (?)’ (Thieme); ‘Dem bei jedem Soma festhockenden, dem hohen Indra, singt sogar der Reiche ein hohes (Lied) als Ansporn’ (Geldner 1901); ‘Der sich bei jedem Preßtrank zu Hause fühlt, auf den hohen Indra

& Brereton’s translation to ‘even the stranger chants...’. However, all these translators construe $\acute{a} \acute{i}d$ with *arís* ‘the stranger’. So does Sāyaṇa, who according to Geldner (1901: 80) explains $\acute{a} \acute{i}d$ *arís* as *sarvo ’pi yajamānaḥ* ‘everyone who sacrifices’, which Geldner rejects. Contrary to these interpretations, I would expect $\acute{a} \acute{i}d$ to be associated with the preceding word, i.e. *brhaté* ‘to the lofty one’. Tichy (1995b: 331) regards \acute{a} as a verbally oriented local particle and translates *íd* as ‘truly’ (‘wahrhaftig’).⁵⁴⁶ However, as already remarked, the verb *arc-* does not occur with \acute{a} elsewhere, so that I do not follow this view. Under the assumption that \acute{a} is emphatic and has functions similar to *íd*, one might assume that both particles function together as an emphasizer. In Section 5.7, I argued that *íd* after nominal predicates can be used to emphasize that the predicate holds true for the subject and I also assumed that this use can be found with attributes and appositions. Thus, *brhaté á íd* might be translated as ‘to the one who truly is lofty’. The combination of the two particles might be employed to create even more emphasis than single *íd*. Compare for instance English *definitely* vs. *most definitely* (cf. Simon-Vandenberg 2008). Since the chant that the stranger performs is also described as ‘lofty’, the strong emphasis might be used to make clear that Indra deserves such a chant. I must admit, however, that this interpretation is rather uncertain.

Regarding 4 of the 5 attestations of $\acute{a} \acute{i}d$ in the Rigveda, I follow the analysis by Tichy (1995b) that this collocation does not have a special meaning but that it can be compared to other instances of local particles followed by *íd*. However, I do not follow her analysis of ex. (559), where I take \acute{a} to be an emphatic particle rather than a local particle. There, I tentatively suggest an analysis according to which $\acute{a} \acute{i}d$ together emphasize that the property denoted by *brhaté* holds true for Indra. Like Tichy (1995b), I find no evidence that suggests the presence of an interjection *éd* in the Rigveda. Regarding the function of *íd* in the remaining 4 instances, one may assume that it is the same as with other local particles and thus as with finite verbs. In ex. (556) it may be interpreted as an emphasizer; in exx. (555), (557) and (558) it is plausible to assume that it expresses the urgency of the request. Notice, however that in exx. (555) and (558), Jamison & Brereton (2014) translate $\acute{a} \acute{i}d$ as ‘just here’ or ‘right here’, respectively. This indicates that *íd* has a different, intensificatory, function (Section 5.3). The same interpretation is possible for exx. (556) and (557) as well. On the one hand, this would suggest that \acute{a} is to be grouped together with other adverbs rather than with the other local particles. On the other hand,

singt sogar der Standesherr ein hohes (Lied) als Ansporn’ (Geldner 1951–1957); ‘der bei jedem Preßtrank Behagen (findet), auf den hohen (Indra) singt sogar der (einer fremden?) Sippe Angehörige ein hohes (Lied), für Indra singt er ein kraftvolles’ (Witzel & Gotō).

⁵⁴⁶ ‘Ihm, der sich bei jeder Somapressung wohl fühlt, dem hohen Indra singt der Herr wahrhaftig ein hohes Kraftlied zu’.

ex. (553) suggests that *íd* after local particles may fulfill functions that are observable in other contexts as well. Interestingly, with respect to exx. (555), (557) and (558), both interpretations would yield a similar pragmatic effect. In ex. (394) of Section 5.3, *íd* occurs in a request after the nominal denoting the goal. As it appears to be somewhat redundant, I assumed that it might be used to urge the addressee to come without detours. In a similar vein, I assume that *íd* after imperatives, or local particles in clauses containing imperatives, can be used to make the request more urgent, and exx. (555), (557) and (558) above contain requests.

In this section, I have examined the occurrences of *íd* after local particles. I have confirmed the view that the use of *íd* after local particles is comparable to its use after finite verbs. It is used as a marker of epistemic modality (ex. (543)), with adhortative function (ex. (544)) and as an emphasizer, emphasizing the truth of a proposition (ex. (546)). Moreover, in ex. (545) *íd* occurs after a local particle in a clause where the copula from the previous clause, which is in the optative, has to be supplied, and here *íd* yields the same quantificational and/or emphasizing reading as when it occurs after the predicate noun. In these cases, I also find a link between the clauses containing *íd* and the previous contexts. I have found no clear case of *íd* following a local particle with nominal orientation and therefore conclude that *íd* occurs only with verbally oriented local particles and those that function as an adverb. I have identified a passage in which *íd* after a local particle probably marks exhaustive focus (ex. (553)). In a further case, *íd* follows a local particle that probably functions as a discourse marker (ex. (552)), but the interpretation is uncertain. As with finite verbs, *íd* has the ability to cause a local particle to be accented (ex. (554)). Regarding the collocation *á íd (éd)*, I have outlined that in 4 instances it is unproblematic to interpret *á* as a local particle (exx. (555)–(558)). In one instance, I consider *á* to be emphatic and tentatively assume that *íd* is used to reinforce this function (ex. (559)). In the cases where *á* is a local particle, I am not certain whether *íd* is to be interpreted as an emphasizer, as adhortative, or as intensificatory.

5.10 *íd* after interrogative proforms

The Rigveda contains 4 passages in which the particle *íd* follows an interrogative proform. Grassmann (1873: 205f.), who mentions only one passage, renders *íd* in this context as the German modal particle *doch*, but a closer examination of the passages with *íd* after interrogative proforms is necessary. In order to compare them and to determine the function of *íd* in this context, I give the four passages below:

(560) *agnīm dūtām prāti yád ábravītana / áśvaḥ kártvo rátha utéha kártuvaḥ / dhenúḥ kártvā yuvaśá kártuvā duvā / táni bhrātar ánu vaḥ kṛtvī émasi //*

<i>cakṛvāmsa</i>		<i>ṛbhavas</i>		<i>tád</i>	
do:PTCP.PERF.ACT.NOM.PL.M		Ṛbhu:VOC.PL.M		DEM:ACC.SG.N	
<i>apṛchata</i>	/	<i>kuvéd [= kvá íd]</i>		<i>abhūd</i>	<i>yáḥ</i>
ask:IPRF.2PL		where+PRT		become:AOR.3SG	REL:NOM.SG.M
<i>syá</i>		<i>dūtó</i>		<i>na</i>	<i>ājagan</i>
DEM:NOM.SG.M		messenger:NOM.SG.M		1PL.ACC	go:PLUPRF.3SG

‘3. When you replied to the messenger Agni, “A horse must be made, and a chariot also must be made here. A milk-cow must be made, and the two must be made young. When we have done these things, brother, we will follow you [=gods].”

4. Having done these things, Ṛbhus, you asked this: “**Just** where has he gone who came here to us as a messenger?” RV 1.161.3–4b

(561) *prá tát te adyá śipiviṣṭa nāma / aryáḥ śamsāmi vayúnāni vidvān / táṃ tvā gṛṇāmi tavásam átavyān / kṣáyantam asyá rájasaḥ parāké //*

<i>kím</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>te</i>		<i>viṣṇo</i>		<i>paricákṣiyam</i>
what	PRT	2SG.GEN		Viṣṇu:VOC.SG.M		LP.look:GDV.NOM.SG.N
<i>bhūt</i>		/	<i>prá</i>	<i>yád</i>	<i>vavakṣé</i>	<i>śipiviṣṭó</i>
become:AOR.INJ.3SG		LP	LP	when	speak:PERF.MID.2SG	Śipiviṣṭa:NOM.SG.M
<i>asmi</i>	/	<i>mā</i>	<i>várpo</i>		<i>asmád</i>	<i>ápa gūha</i>
be:1SG		NEG	shape:ACC.SG.N		1PL.ABL	LP hide:INJ.2SG
<i>etád</i>	/	<i>yád</i>	<i>anyárūpaḥ</i>			<i>samithé</i>
DEM:ACC.SG.N		when	with.other.form:NOM.SG.M			conflict:LOC.SG.N
<i>babhūtha</i>						
be:PERF.2SG						

‘5. This name of yours, o Śipiviṣṭa, of you the stranger do I proclaim today, I who know the (hidden) patterns. I hymn you, the strong—I, less strong—you who rule over this dusky realm in the distance.

6. Was (this speech) of yours to be disregarded, when you proclaimed of yourself: “I am Śipiviṣṭa”? Do not hide away this shape from us, when you have appeared in another form in the clash.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1010)

‘... What was there to be blamed in thee, O Vishṇu ...’ (Griffith 1896–1897: II, 95) RV 7.100.5–6

(562) *vásyāṃ indrāsi me pitúr / utá bhrātur ábhuñjataḥ / mātā ca me chadayathaḥ samā vaso / vasutvanāya rádhase //*

<i>kúveyatha</i>		<i>kuvéd [= kvá íd]</i>		<i>asi</i>	/
where+go:PERF.2SG		where+PRT		be:2SG	
<i>purutrā</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>dhí</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>mánaḥ</i>	
in.many.places	PRT	for	2SG.GEN	mind:NOM.SG.N	

‘6. You are better for me, Indra, than a father and than a brother who benefits not. You and a mother seem to me to be alike, o you who are good for goods and largesse.

7. Where have you gone? Where are you? For your mind is in very many places.⁵⁴⁷ RV 8.1.6–7

(563) <i>ávā</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>vājayúṃ</i>	<i>ráthaṃ</i>	/
help:IMP.2SG	1PL.GEN	seeking.prize:ACC.SG.M	chariot:ACC.SG.M	
<i>sukáraṃ</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>kím</i> <i>ít</i> <i>pári</i>	/	<i>asmán</i> <i>sú</i>
easy:NOM.SG.N	2SG.GEN	what PRT LP		1PL.ACC PRT
<i>jigyúṣas</i>		<i>kṛdhi</i>		
win:PTCP.PERF.ACT.ACC.PL.M		do:AOR.IMP.2SG		

‘Help our chariot that seeks the prize. Easy for you to do. Why this runaround? Just make us victorious!’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 1179)

‘... What is in the way? ...’ (Velankar 1947–1948: 3) RV 8.80.6

In each of exx. (560)–(562), I have given the previous stanza, for reasons of space without glosses, to show what the previous contexts are. A comparison of the four questions and the contexts in which they appear indicates that they are quite different in nature and therefore, the function of *íd* appears to be as well. In ex. (560), the Ṛbhus expect Agni to await them and therefore utter the question out of surprise. In contrast, the question containing *íd* in ex. (562) is basically a repetition of the immediately preceding question, albeit with different wording, since both ask about the whereabouts of Indra. Moreover, the following pāda indicates that the speaker already knows that Indra is difficult to find. Thus, unlike the Ṛbhus in ex. (560) he is not surprised. In exx. (561) and (563), the exact interpretation of *kím* is unclear. In principle, this form is the NOM/ACC.SG.N of the interrogative pronoun *ká-* and therefore means ‘what?’, but it can also be translated as ‘how? whence? wherefore? why?’; moreover it can function not as a WH-word but as a particle that marks a polar question (Monier-Williams 1899: 282, see also Etter 1985: 54–56). In ex. (563), Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1179) translate *kím* as ‘why’ whereas Geldner (1951–1957: II, 407) translates it as ‘what’ (‘was’). In ex. (561) Griffith (1896–1897: II, 95) translates it as ‘what’ (cf. also Etter 1985: 116; 236) while Jamison & Brereton (2014: 1010) interpret it as a particle. At least in ex. (563), this should not have a great impact on the interpretation of *íd*. In both interpretations the question in pāda b can be understood as an impudent rhetorical question that is used to make Indra help the poet and his associates, for as Jamison (comm.VIII.2: ad loc.) observes, this stanza consists of “abrupt commands and almost insolent asides”. Hence, this is again a different context than in exx. (560) and (562). The most difficult of the four passages is ex. (561). Griffith (1896–1897: II, 95) and Jamison (comm.VII: ad loc.) admit their lack of understanding of the meaning of stanza 6. Therefore, it is hardly possible to determine the function of *íd* in this case.

⁵⁴⁷ The translation of pāda 7b deviates from Jamison & Brereton (2014); see Section 4.5.

Since the only four Rigvedic instances of *íd* after an interrogative pronoun occur in different contexts it is difficult to determine the function of the particle. An item that resembles Vedic *íd* is German *nur* (or *bloß*), because it functions as a restrictive focus particle and as a discourse particle and it can also occur in questions. Bayer & Obenauer (2011: 454) give the following example for the latter use:

(564) *Wo hast du nur / bloß meine Schlüssel hingelegt?*
 where have you NUR/ BLOSS my keys put-down

‘Where did you put my keys (I have already looked everywhere)?’

The discourse particle *nur* is used in questions to express that the speaker has already considered several possible answers to the question but all of them have been false (Bayer & Obenauer 2011: 455). In the difficult ex. (561), Hoffmann (1967: 78f.) renders *íd* as ‘nur’.⁵⁴⁸ Such an analysis is also possible for ex. (562). Here, the question is rephrased so that one can assume that the first, virtually identical, question has yielded no answer. In ex. (560) such analysis seems less likely, for I assume that the Ṛbhus’ question is a reaction to their surprise regarding Agni’s absence. An even clearer counterexample is ex. (563). Given that *íd* occurs in a rhetorical question, the poet already knows the answer, namely that nothing should be in his way. As a result, I am uncertain what the exact function of *íd* after an interrogative proform is.

5.11 *íd* as a pronoun

It has long been noted and it is the *communis opinio* that Vedic *íd* etymologically is a NOM/ACC.SG.N of the demonstrative stem, i.e. **í-d* (cf. Mayrhofer 1992–2001: 190, Dunkel 2014: 377). I do not follow the tentative suggestion by Scarlata (1999: 42) that *íd* might contain an old instrumental ending **-t*, the existence of which he considers insecure. The literature review in the beginning of Section 5 has shown that it is also a widely accepted assumption that synchronically, Vedic *íd* only functions as a particle. Nevertheless, *íd* has also been claimed to exhibit remnants of its pronominal function in the Rigveda. In this section I, will address this issue.

As it is the standard view that *íd* functions only as a particle, there ought to be cases in which it is clearly more plausible to assume that *íd* functions as a pronoun instead of a particle in order to justify the claim that it still has pronominal function. Such a clear case has to fulfill the following criteria: The context requires the presence of a nominal in the nominative or accusative singular but no other (pro)nominal apart from *íd* is present; it has to be clear that the

⁵⁴⁸ ‘Was ist nur daran für dich Tadelnswertes, Viṣṇu, daß du dich bekannt gemacht hast?’

potential referent of *íd* is a neuter; moreover, it should be implausible to assume that *íd* has one of the functions that I have described thus far in my study. Note that in Vedic Sanskrit null anaphoras frequently occur (Keydana 2009: 134f.; Keydana & Luraghi 2012: 123–127; Reinöhl 2016: 34–36). Therefore, e.g. the absence of an overt object with a transitive verb alone cannot be a certain criterion. See on this matter also my criteria for the investigation of *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* in Section 6 and the caveats that I mention in Section 6.1.1. In the following, I will discuss the different groups of passages that can be established based on my criteria, which would have to be fulfilled in order for *íd* to be interpreted as a pronoun. As several passages may be interpreted differently, I will not give any numbers regarding how many passages can be subsumed under each group. I will only give some guiding examples to illustrate my criteria.

In the first group, it can be excluded that *íd* functions as a pronoun because it cannot be a NOM/ACC.SG.N:

(565) <i>tám</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>gachanti</i>	<i>juhúvas</i>	<i>tám</i>
DEM:ACC.SG.M	PRT	go:3PL	ladle:NOM.PL.F	DEM:ACC.SG.M
	<i>árvatīr</i>			
	mare:NOM.PL.F			

‘**Just** to him go the offering ladles; to him the mares [=streams of ghee?].’ RV 1.145.3a
 The predicate of the clause in which *íd* appears is a plural form so that *íd* cannot be the subject. It also cannot encode the goal of the movement because this is already encoded by the masculine accusative *tám* ‘to him’, which refers to Agni. In this first group of passages I also subsume the passage that Kupfer (2002:323–325), who believes that the pronominal function of *íd* has not disappeared entirely in the Rigveda, gives as a possible attestation of pronominal *íd*:

(566) <i>vétíd</i> [= <i>vétī íd</i>]	<i>divó</i>	<i>janúṣā</i>	<i>kác</i>
pursue:3SG+PRT	heaven:ABL.SG.M	birth:INS.SG.N	what:ACC.SG.N
<i>cid</i>	<i>á</i>	<i>śúcir</i>	/
PRT	LP	shiny:NOM.SG.M	<i>jyók</i>
			for.long
<i>gárbho</i>	<i>yád</i>	<i>ácyutam</i>	<i>cid</i>
child:NOM.SG.M	REL:NOM.SG.N	immovable:NOM.SG.N	PRT
			eat:3SG

‘He, ablaze right from his birth, pursues any (food) whatever from heaven here. For a long time the embryo eats just what is immovable.’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 789)

‘Denn (der) begehrt tagsüber **danach** (sc. nach Nahrung), leuchtend schon bei (der) Geburt. Seit langer Zeit verzehrt (der) Neugeborene selbst das, (was) fest ist.’ (Kupfer 2002: 324)⁵⁴⁹ RV 6.15.1cd

Kupfer believes that *íd* encodes the object in this passage. She argues that if *íd* had the function of a particle in pāda c, *vétī* would lack an overt object in the accusative or genitive. As she finds

⁵⁴⁹ She bases her translation on Geldner (1951).

such a construction unparalleled in the Rigveda, she interprets *íd* as a cataphoric pronoun in the accusative which refers to *ácyutam*, which occurs in the next clause. Thus, it appears that two of my criteria are fulfilled. The verb lacks an overt object and the context suggests that its referent is a neuter nominal. However, a closer look reveals that this is only apparently the case and a different interpretation is possible: The clause in pāda c does in fact contain an accusative, viz. *kád cid*. This collocation has the meaning ‘any’ or ‘anything’. In my discussion of this example in Section 4.3.1, I argued that this indefinite pronoun should be interpreted as the direct object of *véti*, as is the case in the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 789) given in ex. (566).⁵⁵⁰ The subject cannot be encoded by *íd* either because the presence of the nominative *śucis* ‘shiny’ shows that the subject is masculine. Moreover, in Section 5.8, where I discussed this example again, I suggested that *íd* should be interpreted as an emphasizer after the finite verb. Hence, I deem this no convincing example in favor of a pronominal interpretation of *íd*.

In the second group, I subsume passages where *íd* might function as a pronoun from a purely syntactic point of view but where the context speaks against such an interpretation:

(567) <i>viśvāmitrā</i>	<i>arāsata</i>	/	<i>bráhma</i>	
Viśvamitra:NOM.PL.M	give:AOR.MID.3PL		formulation:ACC.SG.N	
<i>índrāya</i>	<i>vajrīṇe</i>	/	<i>kárad</i>	<i>ín</i>
Indra:DAT.SG.M	with.mace:DAT.SG.M		do:AOR.SBJV.3SG	PRT
<i>naḥ</i>	<i>surādhasaḥ</i>			
1PL.ACC	well.rewarded:ACC.PL.M			

‘The Viśvāmitras have given the formulation to Indra who bears the mace. He will make us well rewarded.’ RV 3.53.13

Considering the clause in pāda c in isolation, *íd* could be its subject: ‘It will make us well rewarded’. However, the context clearly suggests that it is Indra who will reward the poet and his associates so that I follow the translations in assuming a null anaphora as the subject. Instead of being the subject, I consider *íd*, which follows a verb in the subjunctive, to express the certainty of the poet (cf. Section 5.8.2).

The last group is constituted by those passages in which it is most tempting to interpret *íd* as a pronoun, i.e. those where it is syntactically possible to interpret it as a NOM/ACC.SG.N and where the surrounding context contains a potential referent. Consider the following passage:

(568) <i>agnír</i>	<i>havíḥ</i>	<i>śamitā</i>	<i>sūdayāti</i>	/
Agni:NOM.SG.M	offering:ACC.SG.N	Śamitar:NOM.SG.M	sweeten:SBJV.3SG	

⁵⁵⁰ This is still the case in Jamison’s (comm.VI.1: ad loc.) emended version: ‘Just he, blazing from birth, pursues any oblation whatever all the way to heaven’.

<i>séd [sá íd]</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>hótā</i>	<i>satyátaro</i>
DEM:NOM.SG.M+PRT	PRT	Hotar:NOM.SG.M	real:COMP.NOM.SG.M
<i>yajāti</i>	/	<i>yáthā</i>	<i>devānām</i>
sacrifice:SBJV.3SG		because	god:GEN.PL.M
			<i>jānimāni</i>
			birth:ACC.PL.N
<i>véda</i>			
know:PERF.3SG			

‘Agni, the Śamitar-priest, will sweeten the offering. And **it is** he, the more real Hotar [=Agni], **who** will offer sacrifice, since he knows the births of the gods.’ RV 3.4.10b–d

In this passage it is possible to interpret *íd* as the object of *yajāti* ‘he sacrifices’: ‘He, the real Hotar will sacrifice it’. A potential referent is the neuter nominal *havís* ‘offering’ in the previous clause. What supports this analysis is the fact that a pronoun referring to *havís* is attested elsewhere as the object of the verb *yaj-*:

(569) <i>ágne</i>	<i>vittād</i>	<i>dhavišo [= haviṣas]</i>
Agni:VOC.SG.M	perceive:PERF.IMP.2SG	oblation:GEN.SG.N
<i>yád</i>	<i>yājāma</i>	
REL:ACC.SG.N	sacrifice:SBJV.1PL	

‘O Agni, take notice of this libation which we offer.’ (Müller 1891: 352) RV 5.60.6d

Here, the relative pronoun *yád*, which is the object of *yājāma* ‘we will sacrifice’ refers to *haviṣas* ‘of the sacrifice’ in the main clause.⁵⁵¹ Nevertheless, the analysis that *íd* encodes the object of *yaj-* in ex. (568) is not compelling, because this verb also occurs without an object, as the following passage shows:

(570) <i>sukṣetriyá</i>	<i>sugātuyá</i>	/
desire.for.good.fields:INS.SG.F	desire.for.good.passage:INS.SG.F	
<i>vasūyá</i>	<i>ca</i>	<i>yājāmahe</i>
desire.for.goods:INS.SG.F	and	sacrifice:1PL

‘With a desire for good lands, for easy passage, and for goods we offer sacrifice’ RV 1.97.2ab

Such a use of *yáj-* is also assumed by the translations into English, German and French of ex. (568) and I follow this view. Furthermore, it is well possible to assign *íd* the function of a focus particle. I assume that it either marks exhaustive focus, which would be in accordance with the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 474), or it functions as an identifier, possibly in combination with the particle *u*, which would be in accordance with the translations by Geldner (1951–1957: I, 340) and Witzel et al. (2013: 21).⁵⁵² Throughout the Rigveda, I find no text passage that fulfills the above-mentioned criteria. I therefore adhere to the traditional view that Vedic *íd* synchronically is a particle and not a pronoun.

⁵⁵¹ Jamison & Brereton (2014: 740) interpret *yád* as a conjunction.

⁵⁵² ‘Derselbe soll als der echte Hotṛ unter den beiden das Opfer vollziehen’ (Geldner); ‘Ebender soll als der wirklichere Hotar (von den beiden) opfern’ (Witzel et al.).

Even though I conclude that *íd* is not used as a pronoun in the Rigveda, its pronominal origin is according to Paczkowski (2012) still traceable. He (2012: 126) believes that the use of *íd* as an emphatic particle originates in a cleft construction. He assumes “that the ancestor of the Vedic language employed *íd* in a correlative diptych cleft of the type [*yád* X (*asti*)] *íd* ... ‘what is X, that ...’”. By means of the square brackets he indicates clause boundaries. Consider the following attested example:

(571) <i>ṛtám</i>	<i>śámsanta</i>	<i>ṛtám</i>	<i>ít</i>
truth:ACC.SG.N	recite:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.PL.M	truth:ACC.SG.N	PRT
<i>tá</i>	<i>āhur</i>		
DEM:NOM.PL.M	speak:PERF.3PL		

‘Reciting the truth, they speak **just** the truth’ RV 3.4.7c

For this clause, without the secondary predicate *ṛtám śámsantas* ‘reciting the truth’, Paczkowski (2012: 128) reconstructs the following underlying structure:

(572) *[[<i>(yád)</i>	<i>ṛtám</i>	<i>(ásti)</i>	<i>ít</i>
REL:ACC.SG.N	truth:NOM.SG.N	be:3SG	ACC.SG.N
<i>tá</i>	<i>āhur]</i>		
DEM:NOM.PL.M	speak:PERF.3PL		

‘what is truth, **this** they speak’

Paczkowski (2012: 129–131) finds further synchronic support for his analysis in the Rigvedic data. Both types of evidence can be exemplified by the following passage:

(573) <i>véṣíd</i> [= <i>véṣi</i> <i>íd</i>]	<i>u</i>	<i>asya</i>	<i>dūtíyam</i>
pursue:2SG+PRT	PRT	DEM:GEN.SG.M	embassy:ACC.SG.N

‘you *set* your attention on his embassy’⁵⁵³ RV 4.9.6a

Paczkowski (2012: 131) reconstructs the following underlying structure:

(574) *[[<i>(yád)</i>	<i>véṣi]</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>asya</i>
REL:ACC.SG.N	pursue:2SG	PRT	PRT	DEM:GEN.SG.M
<i>dūtíyam</i>	<i>(ásti)]</i>			
embassy:ACC.SG.N	be:3SG			

‘what you set your attention on, this is his embassy’

He (2012: 129–131) assumes that the following two points support his analysis: Firstly, according to his reconstruction, the finite verb originally occurred in the relative clause. This might explain the accentuation related to the presence of *íd* because usually verbs in the main clause are unaccented whereas they are accented in subordinate clauses (see Section 5.8.1). Secondly, he observes that *íd* is frequently followed by the particle *u*, which according to Klein (1978b: 188f.) frequently follows pronouns that are coreferential with other pronouns. In the

⁵⁵³ The translation is adopted from Paczkowski (2012: 131).

reconstructed structure, it follows *íd*, which is the correlative of the relative pronoun. As a further argument, Paczkowski adduces that according to Klein (1978b: 16) only seldom do other elements than *íd* intervene between *u* and its host, so that one might argue that *íd* used to be its original host. In the reconstructed ex. (574), *u* occurs in the second position of the main clause after a pronoun, a position it regularly assumes. Even though this is plausible, these synchronic findings should not be overrated. It is doubtful whether the presence of *u* after *íd* can be attributed to the former presence of a coreferential relative pronoun. At least in ex. (573), which Paczkowski gives, this does not seem to be the case. The preceding stanza begins with the verb *véši* ‘you set your attention’ too, so that with Klein (1978b: 148) I assume that *u* occurs in the sequence *verb ... verb u* and conjoins the two stanzas. Regarding the accent of verbs preceding *íd*, it needs to be mentioned again that in passages like ex. (573), the accent of the verb cannot certainly be attributed to *íd* because it occurs in the first position in the clause or pāda. This also means that the verb would be accented regardless of whether in the original construction it occurred in the subordinate or in the main clause. Another passage of *íd* after an accented verb that Paczkowski (2012: 129) gives is RV 5.32.5b, which I discussed as ex. (506) in Section 5.8. There, the accent can be attributed to *íd* (Jamison comm.V: ad loc.) and Paczkowski’s cleft analysis might in fact account for the accent. However, I have also shown in Section 5.8 that examples in which verbal accent can be attributed to *íd* are quite rare. There are only 7 such cases and there are also 3 in which the verb is unaccented. Especially these 3 examples speak against the analysis of a previous subclause because I argued that the accentuation pattern (accented local particle and unaccented verb) is different from what one would expect in a subclause (unaccented local particle and accented verb). Thus, with Klein (1992: 2) one can simply assume that the accent on the verb is due to emphasis. A further question that remains is whether all usages of *íd* can immediately be traced back to the same cleft construction. For instance, Paczkowski treats the exclusive use of *íd* in ex. (571) and its use after the finite verb in ex. (573) alike. However, according to my findings in Section 5.8 *íd* should function as an emphazier in the latter passage.

Even though I have pointed towards certain difficulties regarding the synchronic evidence for Paczkowski’s (2012) diachronic hypothesis, in principle I consider it to be plausible. For as can be seen in Section 5.1, in cases where *íd* marks exhaustive focus its translational equivalent in English is often a cleft construction. However, this is not the only suggestion for the origin of *íd*. Dunkel (2014: 377) suggests that the exclusive nature of *íd* derives from an adverbial use

of the accusative, viz. to express spatial extension. Thus, Dunkel assumes *íd* to have expressed the meaning ‘this far (and no further)!’ (‘soweit (und nicht mehr)!’).⁵⁵⁴

Regardless of which of these hypotheses is correct, this does not mean that synchronically *íd* is to be interpreted as a pronoun in these cases, so that for my synchronic analysis of *íd* I conclude that the traditional view is correct and *íd* functions only as a particle in the Rigveda.

5.12 Summary

In this major section, I have investigated the multiple functions of *íd*. In Section 5.1, I started with its function as an exclusive particle. I found that it can have both scalar and non-scalar interpretation. The latter occurs also in contexts that introduce scale reversal. There appear to be no restrictions with respect to the lexical or syntactic category of its focus and with respect to polarity. I found that in addition to having the functions of an exclusive particle, *íd* is also able to express exhaustive focus. Both in the exclusive and the exhaustive function, *íd* can be associated with an entire clause and thereby fulfill a function similar to an adversative marker.

Section 5.2 showed that *íd* can be used for emphatic assertion of identity, where it can but need not be associated with proforms. It also can but need not occur in contexts that implicate a conflict between two propositions. I pointed out the similar behavior of the particle *u* but I am not certain in how far they differ.

Section 5.3 was concerned with *íd* having a specificatory or intensificatory function, which are closely related to each other. The latter function can be observed when *íd* is associated with local expressions or standards of comparison. The specificatory function appears to be present in particular with the adverb *ād* ‘then’. However, in this context it can also exclude all earlier points in time or all other places. Also with respect to *ād*, I have shown that *íd* may occur after this adverb, after the conjunction in the dependent subclause or after both.

In Section 5.4, I examined *íd* after quantifying expressions. I argued that after universal quantifiers, it functions as a slack regulator, i.e. it reduces the tolerance for exceptions. After numerals, it is often difficult to distinguish between the reading of a slack regulator and of a scalar exclusive particle. I argued in addition that *íd* may also have the function of a slack regulator when it occurs after *āmreḍitas* that express universal quantification. However, the difficulty here is that often the exact interpretation of the *āmreḍitas* themselves is not clear, which complicates the analysis of *íd* in this context.

⁵⁵⁴ The cleft hypothesis is probably also not compatible with the etymological suggestion by Scarlata (1999: 42), which I do not follow.

Although it is not remarked often in the literature, in Section 5.5 I argued for an interpretation of *íd* as an adnominal intensifier. In some cases, it seems that it has a combined function of an intensifier and of expressing contrast.

Section 5.6 was concerned with possible uses of *íd* as an additive particle and as a particularizer, respectively. In the examples that I examined, it was possible to assume another function of the particle and therefore I do not consider *íd* to have one of the two functions. As for the collocation *caná íd*, I have not been able to determine its function.

In Section 5.7, I investigated *íd* after nominal predicates. Based on a comparison with the particle *eva* in Classical Sanskrit, I argued that *íd* yields a reading of universal quantification when it occurs with plural predicates. I furthermore argued that with singular predicates it functions as an emphasizer, i.e. it emphasizes the truth of the proposition. I found this use also for attributes, appositions and secondary predicates. The nuance of *íd* may change when the copula of the clause, if present, occurs in another mood. Furthermore, I assumed that with plural predicates *íd* is not a genuine universal quantifier because this reading can be cancelled when another quantifier is present.

In Section 5.8, I continued investigating *íd* after predicates, but now those constituted by finite verbs. First, I investigated the accentuation of the verb before *íd*. I found that in those cases where it is not accented, it forms a prosodic word with a preceding local particle, a constellation which is not found with accented verbs before *íd*. Moreover, the local particle occurs after a pāda boundary or a caesura. Regarding the function of *íd*, I found it to be similar to that after nominal predicates. Depending on the mood, it can be an emphasizer, express epistemic modality, emphasize a wish or be adhortative. In addition, it usually signals a semantic link between the clause in which it occurs and the preceding claus(es).

These functions I also found in Section 5.9, which was concerned with *íd* after local particles. In the passages where *íd* follows a local particle, the position of the latter points to verbal orientation or the function of an adverb. I have not found *íd* after adnominal particles, which would point to a nominal orientation. However, in one case the local particle followed by *íd* functions as a connective, in which case I have not been able to determine the function of *íd*. I have also shown that apart from one case, the collocation *á íd* is to be analyzed as the other instances of local particle + *íd*. In the one exception, *á* is emphatic and both particles possibly combine their emphatic functions. However, the data suggest that *íd* does not have a uniform function after local particles. In some cases, it can also be assigned one of the functions that I have described in other sections.

In Section 5.10, I examined the occurrences of *íd* after interrogative proforms. Although I assume it to function as a discourse particle in this context, I have not been able to determine its exact function there.

In Section 5.11, I investigated an alleged pronominal function of *íd* and concluded that it does not exist in the Rigveda. In addition, I commented on the hypothesis that the synchronically attested functions of *íd* derive from older cleft constructions. Even though I pointed to some problems regarding the synchronic data, I find this hypothesis still plausible.

As has been the case with *cid*, the multiplicity of functions of *íd* is conspicuous. However, for *íd* the picture appears to be more homogenous than for *cid*. All functions that I have identified are in some way related to the notion of exclusion. This is obvious for cases where it functions as an exclusive particle. Yet, also uses that at first sight appear to be inherently different, e.g. its use after predicates can be explained as exclusion of the non-truth of the proposition. At the end of Section 5.2, I pointed out that some of the functions I have described here are especially closely related and it may even be the case that different interpretations of several groups of passages are the result of the researcher's theoretical approach rather than of an actual difference in the use of the form. Thus, when *íd* occurs with similes ('just like X') it may be described as intensificatory, as an identifier or as a slack regulator. Even though I see a clear relation between all the different functions of *íd*, the exact nature of these relations still demands further analysis. Thus, in Section 5.1 I drew attention to the fact that I consider *íd* to function as an exclusive particle and to mark exhaustive focus. This is odd because according to my theoretical framework, I consider the former to entail the exclusion of additional alternatives and the latter only to conversationally implicate this exclusion. Therefore, it appears that one would either have to assume that there are two homonymous items *íd*₁ and *íd*₂ with very similar and yet different meanings, or one would have to adapt the theoretical framework. As the goal of my study is primarily descriptive I will not discuss this matter any further, but I would like to stimulate further research on this matter.

6 The employment of *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* in the Rigveda

This section is concerned with the Rigvedic enclitic forms *īm*, *ī* and *sīm*. Like *cid* and *íd*, these forms are generally considered to be of pronominal origin (cf. Mayrhofer 1992–2001: I, 205; II, 732). Whereas *īm* is also attested in younger texts, albeit only rarely, *ī* and *sīm* occur only in the Rigveda (Wackernagel & Debrunner 1930: 482; 519). The analysis of their employment will prove to be even more difficult than that of *cid* and *íd* in the previous sections. Firstly, this is due to the lower number of attestations of these forms: *īm* is attested 208 times,⁵⁵⁵ *sīm* 52 times and *ī* only 11 times. With respect to *īm* and *ī*, Kulikov (2012: 727) states that they were not productive anymore as early as in Rigvedic times. Secondly, there is huge disagreement in the literature both with respect to the relationship of these three forms to each other, i.e. whether they are variants of each other or separate lexemes, and with respect to the lexical class they belong to, i.e. whether they are pronouns, particles or both. As a result, I will begin this section with an overview of the previous literature on these forms. Wackernagel & Debrunner (1930: 482–484; 520) provide an overview of the older literature on *īm*, *ī* and *sīm*, which I will include in the following paragraph, but also add other references.

The ancient Indian grammarian Yāska regards *īm* as an expletive particle, like *íd*, and *sīm* as a particle that is expletive or expresses totality (Sarup 1967: 11f.). Böhtlingk & Roth (1855–1875: I, 835; 846; VII, 1015) regard *ī* as a variant of *īm* and characterize both *ī(m)* and *sīm* as particles, the former as emphatic and the latter as generalizing or expletive. Osthoff (1881: 229–232) rejects the assumption that *ī* is a variant of *īm*. He regards *īm* as an emphatic particle that may replace a pronoun and *ī* as an old instrumental that has the meaning ‘in this way, so’ (‘auf diese weise, so’) (see also Dunkel 2014: 377). Speyer (1896: 69) lists *īm* and *sīm*, together with *cid* and *íd* as well as others, under the category of emphasizing and restrictive particles. According to Wackernagel & Debrunner (1930: 483; 520), the first modern scholar to acknowledge a pronominal function of *īm* and *sīm* was Rosen (1830: 11f.), who equates *īm* with *enam* ‘him (ACC.SG.M)’ and *sīm* with *enām* ‘her (ACC.SG.F)’. Similarly, Lassen (1838: 132) considers *sīm* to be the ACC.SG of the feminine demonstrative *sā́*, which, as he surmises, had a variant *sī*. Böhtlingk (1845: 279) assumes that both *īm* and *sīm* are accusative pronouns of the third person but does not address the issue of gender and number, nor their use as particles, similarly to Brugmann (1904: 128).⁵⁵⁶ Lanman (1912: 131) gives *īm* as an accusative singular of all genders, as a particle after interrogative and relative pronouns and as a means to avoid

⁵⁵⁵ This number includes RV 2.13.2, where it is not clear whether *īm* is really present (Roth 1894: 680, Pischel 1897: 65, Oldenberg 1909–1912: I, 198, RIVELEX II, 258).

⁵⁵⁶ For *sīm*, Brugmann (1904: 28) explicitly states that it is used for all numbers and genders.

hiatus. Grassmann (1873: 231–233; 1521f.) regards $\bar{i}(m)$ and $s\bar{i}m$ primarily as accusative pronouns, the former of the third person but for all genders and numbers and the latter for all genders and numbers and even for all persons.⁵⁵⁷ He also observes generalizing as well as other marginal emphasizing functions and assumes that in several instances, $\bar{i}m$ serves to avoid hiatus. Oldenberg (1888: 435), followed by Arnold (1905: 73), even believes that avoiding hiatus is a key function of $\bar{i}m$,⁵⁵⁸ but he rejects the assumption by Grassmann (1873: 233) that in some passages it was not present in the original text but added only later by diaskeuasts. Delbrück (1888: 28) follows Grassmann rather than Böhntlingk & Roth in assuming that $\bar{i}m$ and $s\bar{i}m$ have pronominal function (cf. Delbrück 1893–1900: I, 467–470), but he contends that this function was lost in early times. Hillebrandt (1885: 78) considers $\bar{i}m$ primarily as a particle but follows Grassmann in acknowledging also pronominal function. Gaedicke (1880: 233f.) holds a view similar to Grassmann in that he regards $\bar{i}m$ and $s\bar{i}m$ as accusative pronouns as well as generalizing or emphasizing particles. However, he characterizes both $\bar{i}m$ and $s\bar{i}m$ as neutral with respect to person. Yet differently, Macdonell (1893: 47; 351, 1916: 220; 249) and Geldner (1907–1909: I, 31; 195) interpret both $\bar{i}m$ and $s\bar{i}m$ as accusatives of the third person when they have pronominal function.⁵⁵⁹ Monier-Williams (1899: 170) considers $\bar{i}m$ to be primarily “a particle of affirmation and restriction”, which can also mean ‘now’ and occasionally can replace the pronoun *enam* ‘him (ACC.SG.M)’,⁵⁶⁰ while \bar{i} is either “an interjection of pain or anger” or “a particle implying consciousness or perception, consideration, compassion”.⁵⁶¹ Unlike $\bar{i}m$, he (1899: 1218) regards $s\bar{i}m$ primarily as an object pronoun which is neutral with respect to gender, number and person, but which is commonly used as a particle expressing emphasis or generalization. This description contrasts with his entry from (1872: 117), where he characterizes $s\bar{i}m$ as an emphatic particle equal to *íd*, not mentioning a pronominal use.⁵⁶² Wackernagel & Debrunner (1930: 519f.) explain that in a few passages, $\bar{i}m$ has the function of an accusative pronoun that does not distinguish number, which they also assume for \bar{i} . In the remaining passages, they assign these forms a use similar to $s\bar{i}m$. The latter form they (1930:

⁵⁵⁷ Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 157f.) rejects Grassmann’s view that in two cases $\bar{i}m$ is to be read as *im*.

⁵⁵⁸ Arnold (1897: 339) seems to follow Grassmann.

⁵⁵⁹ Wackernagel (1879: 605f.) seems to follow Grassmann’s analysis of $s\bar{i}m$ but also mentions only neutrality with respect to number and gender. Delbrück (1888: 28) only mentions number and gender as well but in (1893–1900: I, 469f.; 481) he also mentions person and wonders why $s\bar{i}m$ should not be a pronoun of the third person like $\bar{i}m$. Cf. Delbrück (1874: 58; 121), where he assigns equal functions to $\bar{i}m$ and $s\bar{i}m$.

⁵⁶⁰ This view is shared by Apte (1957–1959: I, 392), where there are no entries for \bar{i} or $s\bar{i}m$ in the three volumes. Benfey (1852–1854: II, 50) acknowledges the pronominal origin of $\bar{i}(m)$ but synchronically regards it as a particle with a restrictive function like *íd* (Benfey 1855: 347); similarly Bollensen (1868: 576).

⁵⁶¹ He does not indicate whether they find this use in the Rigveda or elsewhere; compare Benfey (1852–1854: I, 346).

⁵⁶² Similarly, Cappeller (1891: 77) only acknowledges $\bar{i}m$ as an ACC.SG when it has pronominal function, whereas he (1891: 619) describes $s\bar{i}m$ only as emphatic.

482f.) believe to be an accusative pronoun for all genders and numbers. If it is not used in this function, they consider it expletive.

The discord observable in the older literature has also been present in more recent descriptions or analyses of the three forms. Renou (1952: 380) discusses all three forms in one paragraph but does not explicitly state that he regards them as variants of each other. As for their functions, he explains that they are expletive or generalizing particles, whose origin as accusative pronouns is still observable. In contrast, Kanta (1953: 48; 267) gives both forms as pronouns meaning ‘him, her, it, them’, not mentioning a use as a particle, although there are references not only to Macdonell (1910: 81), who only lists *īm* and *sīm* as enclitic pronouns, but also to the relevant passages in Wackernagel & Debrunner (1930). Velankar (1963b: 273), whose glossary only contains an entry for *sīm*, analyzes it as a pronoun that is neutral with respect to number and gender. Hauri (1963: 81–83) treats *ī* as a phonological variant of *īm* and contends that although they can still function as pronouns in the Rigveda, they are in the process of being reduced to particles. Hale (1987: 76–79) regards the form *sīm* as pronominal for syntactic reasons. He observes that in seven instances, *sīm* does not occur in the second position of the clause but with the verb complex, which he considers an archaic feature of enclitic pronouns. Since he does not observe this distribution for *īm*, Hale (1987: 162) believes that the primary synchronic function of *īm* is that of a hiatus-filler. The related form *ī* he believes “to be distributed at least in part for phonological reasons”, viz. after *m* and other labials. Only partly in accordance with this, Kellens & Pirart (1990: 186f.) contend that *sīm* occurs in the function of a petrified gender-neutral pronoun or a particle meaning ‘ever, by chance, one way or another’ (‘jamais, par hasard, d’une manière ou d’une autre’) and Pirart (1997: 144) explains that *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* rarely (“rarement”) occur as pronouns. Yet differently, Gotō (2013: 71) contends that *īm* and *ī* are used as accusative pronouns only for masculine and feminine, whereas *sīm* is used for all genders. He assumes that all three forms can be used as particles. Mayrhofer (1992–2001: I, 205; II, 732) synchronically regards *ī(m)* primarily as a particle but admits that the form is difficult to interpret; he characterizes *sīm* as a particle and as an anaphoric accusative which is indifferent with respect to number and gender. Gippert (2004: 54) regards *īm* as an unaccented modal particle whose origin might be the accusative singular of a pronoun. According to Scarlata (1999: 228f.), *īm* might be a conflation of two adverbs **ih₁* and **im*, both of which might have been old instrumentals in **-m*. He surmises that *īm* could be understood as an accusative, but he also observes that *īm* occurs in similar contexts as the adverb *itthā* ‘so’. In her examination of concessivity in Vedic (cf. Section 4.6), Lühr (1997: 68) regards *īm* and *sīm* as particles that are variants of each other. Outside of concessive contexts, Lühr

(1997: 72) acknowledges a generalizing function of *īm* and *sīm*. She does not discuss cases in which the two forms potentially have pronominal function. Hettrich (1988: 454–456; 558–561) denies a generalizing function of *īm* and *sīm* after conjunctions and relative pronouns. He considers them to be pronouns but also finds rare cases where *īm* occurs as an expletive particle. Rodríguez Adrados (1992: 178) believes that *īm* is the accusative of *ī* ‘he’ (‘él’). Dunkel (2014: 366; 377–383; 741) regards *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* as different forms that have parallel functions, namely that of an accusative pronoun or of an emphatic particle. In his treatment of *sīm*, Dunkel (1992: 172–174) contends that interpreting this form as neutral with respect to gender and number is exaggerated (“übertrieben”). However, he mentions the presence of remnants of a former nominative use of *sīm* in the Rigveda. Pooth & Orqueda (2021: 126) regard *ī* and *īm* as allomorphs and accusative masculine or feminine of all numbers and *sīm* as an accusative of all numbers and genders.

The most recent and also most detailed synchronic analyses of the forms *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* in the Rigveda were conducted by Jamison (1998, 2002), Kupfer (2002: 128–150; 252–260) and RIVELEX (II, 245; 254–263). The latter contains (distinct!) entries for *īm* and *ī*. The entry for *sīm* is due in a later volume that is yet to appear, but since its attestations are not treated in the entries of *īm* and *ī*, I assume that they are regarded as different lexemes there. In addition to being an accusative, Kupfer assigns *ī* the function of a neuter nominative, which is denied by Kulikov (2005: 86, 2012: 727f.). In contrast, RIVELEX (II, 245) regards *ī* only as a particle except for one case in which it is analyzed as an instrumental singular. As for *īm*, RIVELEX (II, 254–263) assigns it also a dative function in addition to the accusative. Furthermore, it is assigned the function of a particle meaning ‘yes, still, really, exactly’.

This review of the literature on *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* gives an impression of how challenging an analysis of the three forms is. Before entering the discussion on how *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* differ as pronouns and particles, respectively, the first vital step is to determine when these forms are actually used as pronouns or particles. The above presentation of previous analyses has also shown that this enterprise is exceedingly difficult. In the literature, a pronominal function of the three forms has often been acknowledged but as I will discuss in more detail, clear instances have also been identified in the Rigveda where this function cannot be present and thus the assumption that all three items are particles imposes itself. Thus, as the basis for my investigation, I make the assumption that all three forms can function both as accusative pronouns of the third person (for all numbers and genders) and as particles. I will, however, bear in mind the ambiguity of most of the cases in which these forms occur. As a result, I will base my investigation of the functions of *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* as pronouns and as particles, respectively,

only on the clearest cases that the Rigveda provides. Based on the previous analyses of these forms, I will distinguish between the following cases:

- 1) The predicate of the clause is intransitive and/or the context speaks against the presence of a 3rd person pronoun in the accusative → *ī(m)/sīm* cannot be pronouns and I assume them to be particles.
- 2) The predicate of the clause is probably transitive and there is no other overt object present in the sentence → *ī(m)/sīm* probably (but not certainly!) have pronominal function (see Section 6.1.1).
- 3) The context suggests that the predicate does not take a direct object, but does not fully exclude it, or at least one other form that qualifies as a potential direct object is present → *ī(m)/sīm* are ambiguous with respect to their respective class membership.

A clear example of the first group is the following text passage. Here, the predicate is a passive aorist and therefore cannot have a direct object (cf. Jamison comm.I.2: ad loc.):⁵⁶³

(575) *sá* ***īm*** *mṛgó* · *ápiyo*
 DEM:NON.SG.M PRT beast:NOM.SG.M from.water:NOM.SG.M
vanargúr / *úpa* *tvací* *upamásyāṃ* *ní*
 in.forest.NOM.SG.M LP skin:LOC.SG.F uppermost:LOC.SG.F LP
dhāyi
 put:AOR.INJ.PASS.3SG

‘This wild beast of the waters that roams in the woods has been installed upon the uppermost skin.’ RV 1.145.5ab

The next example is similar. Here, the predicate *ā gantu* ‘let him go towards’ may occur with an accusative that denotes the goal, but the goal is already expressed by the enclitic pronoun of the first person *nas*:

(576) *utá* *na* ***īm*** *tváṣṭā* *ā* *gantu*
 and 1PL.ACC PRT Tvaṣṭar:NOM.SG.M LP go:AOR.IMP.3SG
áčhā / *smát* *sūrībhir* *abhipitvé* *sajóṣāḥ*
 LP together patron:INS.PL.M evening:LOC.SG.N in.unison:NOM.SG.M

‘And let Tvaṣṭar come right here to us, in concert with the patrons, at the evening mealtime.’ RV 1.186.6

A case that falls within the second group is ex. (577). In this example, the predicate *nís dhámathas* ‘you two blow away’ requires an object and there is no other potential overt object present apart from *sīm*:

(577) *nīḥ* ***sīm*** *adbhyó* *dhámatho* *nīḥ* *śadhásthān*
 LP ACC.SG.M water:ABL.PL.F blow:2DU LP seat:ABL.SG.N

⁵⁶³ As stated in Section 3, the text of all Rigvedic passages is adopted from van Nooten & Holland (1994) and all English translations of Rigvedic passages are quoted from Jamison & Brereton (2014), unless otherwise noted.

‘You two blow **him** [=Śuṣṇa?] out of the water, out of his seat’ RV 5.31.9c

In cases like these, *īm*, *ī* or *sīm* are very probably pronominal forms, but it is nevertheless not certain. I will explain in Section 6.1.1 why this is so. A typical case of the third group can be seen in ex. (578). Here, the predicate *prāti viyantu* ‘let them seek’ takes an accusative object but apart from *īm* there is also another nominal in the accusative, viz. *surabhīṇi* ‘sweet-scented’ present:

(578) *prāti na īm surabhīṇi viyantu*
 LP 1PL.GEN ACC.PL.N sweet.scented:ACC.PL.N seek:IMP.3PL

‘Let them [=the gods] seek **these**, our sweet-scented (oblations).’ RV 7.1.18c

Note that Vedic Sanskrit exhibits only a weak distinction between nouns and adjectives (cf. Section 3), so that nominals which are primarily property-denoting may serve as heads of nominal expressions as well. Among the cases of the third group, I also subsume cases like the following one, where according to Jamison’s (2002: 293) analysis, *sīm* is coreferential with the relative pronoun in the accusative:

(579) *indrāgniyór ánu vratám / úhānā yanti síndhavo / yān sīm bandhād ámuñcatām*
 Indra.Agni:GEN.DU.M LP commandment:ACC.SG.N
 pull:PTCP.AOR.MID.NOM.PL.M go:3SG river:NOM.PL.M REL:ACC.PL.M
 ACC.PL.M bondage:ABL.SG.M LP.free:IPRF.3DU

‘following the commandment of Indra and Agni the rivers go driving, those which the two [=Indra and Agni] freed from bondage.’ RV 8.40.8c–e

The application of these formal criteria reduces the number of attestations of the pronominal forms significantly. According to these criteria, I find 70 cases of pronominal *īm*, 2 cases of pronominal *ī* and 17 cases of pronominal *sīm*. As for the particle use, I find 14 clear attestations of *īm*, only one of *ī* and none of *sīm*.

It is important to mention that even though this approach aims to be as objective as possible, it is in fact not fully objective. I will illustrate some of the problems by the following examples:

(580) *pibā sómam [...] / [...] / [...] / [...] // sá*
 drink:IMP.2SG soma:ACC.SG.M
 ACC.SG.M drink:AOR.IMP.2SG REL:NOM.SG.M with.drink:NOM.SG.M
tárutro
 victorious:NOM.SG.M

‘1. Drink the soma! [...]

2. Drink **it!** You who are the victorious possessor of the silvery drink’ RV 6.17.1–2a

(581) <i>utá</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>īm</i>	<i>matáyo</i>	<i>áśvayogāḥ</i>	/
and	1PL.GEN	ACC.SG.M	thought:NOM.PL.F	horse.yoked:NOM.PL.F	
<i>śíśum</i>		<i>ná</i>	<i>gāvas</i>	<i>táruṇam</i>	<i>rihanti</i>
child:ACC.SG.M		like	cow:NOM.PL.F	tender:ACC.SG.M	lick:3PL

‘And our horse-yoked thoughts lick **him** like cows their tender young.’ RV 1.186.7ab

In the first passage, I consider *īm* to be the object of the imperative *pāhi* ‘drink’. However, according to Grassmann (1873: 800) the verb *pā-* can also be used intransitively, so that RIVELEX (II, 255f.; 259) considers *īm* to be ambiguous between a particle and a pronoun. Nevertheless, I have included this passage in the group of pronominal *īm* because the parallel structure of the first clause in the preceding stanza, which contains the same verb with a direct object, speaks in my view for the interpretation of *īm* as an accusative. The second passage contains further accusatives but they appear to be part of the simile marked by *ná*. Therefore, it would be plausible to assume that *īm*, which refers to Indra (Geldner 1951–1957: I, 267; Witzel & Gotō 2007: 774), constitutes the object of *rihanti* ‘they lick’ and therefore is to be interpreted as a pronoun. However, Griffith (1896–1897: I, 250) mentions that Sāyana “takes the epithet *táruṇam* as applying to Indra ‘the ever-youthful’”, which would mean that it could also be the object of the clause rather than part of the simile. Even though I am skeptical whether this analysis is correct, I have excluded this passage from the clear cases of pronominal *īm*.

6.1 *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* as pronouns

This section deals with those cases in which *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* most likely have pronominal function, i.e. those in which the context requires or strongly favors the presence of an accusative, but no other nominal in this case form is present. I will use these cases in order to identify possible factors that determine the choice for either of the three forms. As a starting point, I will summarize and evaluate the most comprehensive synchronic analyses of the three forms (Section 6.1.1). In my own synchronic analysis of the forms, I will make use of the concept of prominence in order to determine their respective functions (Section 6.1.2).

6.1.1 Previous studies

Jamison (2002: 290f.) bases her assumption that *īm* and *sīm* have pronominal function primarily on Grassmann (1873: 231–233; 1521f.), who observes that they frequently occur in contexts which require an accusative. RIVELEX (II, 254–263) and Kupfer (2002) pursue similar strategies. For instance, regarding the attestation of *īm* in RV 9.89.5, RIVELEX remarks that

īm has to be a pronoun because it is the only possible candidate for an accusative object, which is required by the valence of the verb (“wird von der Verbvalenz gefordert”):

(582) <i>cátasra</i>	īm	<i>ghṛtadúhaḥ</i>	<i>sacante</i>	/
four:NOM.F	ACC.SG.M	giving.ghee:NOM.PL.F	accompany:MID.3PL	
<i>samāné</i>	<i>antár</i>	<i>dharúṇe</i>	<i>nīṣattāḥ</i>	
same:LOC.SG.N	within	support:LOC.SG.N	LP.sit:PPP.NOM.PL.F	

‘Set down within the same support, four, yielding ghee as their milk, accompany **him**.’
RV 9.89.5ab

Jamison (2002: 291f.) pursues the same approach in order to demonstrate that the forms are accusative pronouns. In doing so, the authors make the assumption that *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* are neutral with respect to number and gender. For instance, Jamison (2002: 295) considers *sīm* to be an ACC.PL.M in ex. (583) and an ACC.PL.F in ex. (584):

(583) <i>mahó</i>	<i>deván</i>	<i>yájasi</i>	[...]/ [...]/	<i>arvácaḥ</i>
great:ACC.PL.M	god:ACC.PL.M	sacrifice:2SG		towards.here:ACC.PL.M
sīm	<i>kr̥ṇuhi</i>	<i>agne</i>	<i>ávase</i>	
ACC.PL.M	do:IMP.2SG	Agni:VOC.SG.M	help:DAT.SG.N	

‘You sacrifice to the great gods: [...] Bring **them** nearby for help, Agni.’ RV 6.48.4a–c

(584) <i>indrāya</i>	<i>gāva</i>	<i>āśíram</i>	/	<i>duduhré</i>
Indra:DAT.SG.M	cow:NOM.PL.F	milk:ACC.SG.F		milk:PERF.MID.3PL
<i>vajríṇe</i>	<i>mádhu</i>	/	<i>yát</i>	sīm
with.mace:DAT.SG.M	sweet:ACC.SG.N		because	ACC.PL.F
<i>upahvaré</i>	<i>vidát</i>			
remote.place:LOC.SG.M	find:AOR.INJ.3SG			

‘The cows have milked out the milk-mixture for Indra, the honey for the mace-bearer, since he found **them** in the remote place.’ RV 8.69.6

This general approach may be plausible but nevertheless there is a caveat against it, for a vital point that I want to stress here is that even the absence of another accusative in a sentence containing a transitive verb (as in exx. (582) – (584)) does not require *īm* or *sīm* to be pronominal accusatives. In a non-configurational language like Vedic Sanskrit, null objects are frequently used (Reinöhl 2016: 34–36). Keydana & Luraghi (2012: 126) give the following Rigvedic example, in which the direct object of the second sentence, whose referent is Dabhīti, is non-overt:

(585) <i>sá</i>	<i>pravolhṛ́n</i>	<i>parigátyā</i>	dabhīter	/
DEM:NOM.SG.M	raider:ACC.PL.M	LP.go:CVB	Dabhīti:GEN.SG.M	
<i>víśvam</i>	<i>adhāg</i>	<i>āyudham</i>	<i>iddhé</i>	
every:ACC.SG.N	burn:AOR.3SG	weapon:ACC.SG.N	kindle:PPP.LOC.SG.M	
<i>agnaú</i>	/	<i>sám</i>	<i>góbhir</i>	<i>ásvair</i>
fire:LOC.SG.M		LP	cow:INS.PL.F	horse:INS.PL.M
				<i>asṛjad</i>
				send:IPRF.3SG

ráthebhiḥ
chariot:INS.PL.M

‘Having surrounded the raiders **against Dabhīti**, he burned their every weapon in the kindled fire. He brought **him** together with cows, horses, and chariots.’ RV 2.15.4a–c

Similarly, the objects of the clauses containing *īm/sīm* in exx. (582) – (584) may theoretically be null anaphoras, whereas *īm/sīm* has the function of a particle and not of an object pronoun. Since Keydana & Luraghi (2012: 123–127) observe that null objects do not require a special syntactic environment in which they appear, it is exceedingly difficult to adduce testable criteria as evidence for a pronominal use of *sīm* or *īm* (cf. also Keydana 2009: 134–136). The fact that null objects “always denote referents which belong to the common ground” (Keydana & Luraghi 2012: 126) cannot serve as a distinctive criterion either, since this should also be expected of enclitic pronouns. Passer (2016: 355–360) provides criteria for the occurrence of object deletion in Vedic using centering theory but he does not contrast his findings with contexts of pronominalization.⁵⁶⁴

Even though I aim to stress that the criterion of the lack of an overt accusative that is required in a clause is not as strict as the authors present it, I follow their line of argumentation and adopt it as a criterion for identifying the pronominal use of the forms. Albeit circumstantial, this is in my view the strongest possible evidence that exists for a pronominal function of the three forms. I therefore also assume that the three forms can be used for all numbers and genders. The syntactic criteria adduced by Hale (1987: 76–79), which I have mentioned in my literature review, I do not regard as reliable on their own. He may be correct in observing parallel syntactic behavior between *sīm* and other enclitic pronouns, but the poetic style of the Rigveda may conceal syntactic phenomena. This is also shown in particular for certain instances of *sīm* by Jamison (1998).

RIVELEX (II, 254–263) uses the criterion of a ‘required case form’ also as an argument that in three passages *īm* can be used as a dative. One of these is the following:

(586) <i>yád</i>	<i>īm</i>	<i>mṛgā́ya</i>	<i>hántave</i>
when	DAT.SG.M?	beast:DAT.SG.M	hit:INF.DAT.SG
<i>mahāvadhāḥ</i>		<i>sahásrabhṛṣṭim</i>	<i>uśánā</i>
with.great.weapon:NOM.SG.M		with.thousand.spikes:ACC.SG.M	Uśanā:NOM.SG.M
<i>vadhám</i>		<i>yámat</i>	
weapon:ACC.SG.M		hold:AOR.INJ.3SG	

‘when Uśanā, possessing the great weapon, held the thousand-spiked weapon (out to him), to smash the wild beast.’ RV 5.34.2cd

⁵⁶⁴ On null objects and clitics in ancient Indo-European languages see also Viti (2016).

RIVELEX follows the translation by Hettrich (2007: C.a.V. 58) and assumes that the recipient is overtly encoded by *īm*. However, as the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 700), who supply the recipient in brackets, indicates, it is again also possible to assume a null anaphora here. Since the contexts of potential dative functions of *īm* are rare compared to those in which an accusative interpretation is probable, I will not consider a possible dative function in my study. What I will not consider either are the possible nominative and instrumental functions of *ī* in the following passages:

(587) <i>tát</i> DEM:ACC.SG.N	<i>ta</i> 2SG.GEN	<i>indriyám</i> Indra.power:ACC.SG.N	<i>paramám</i> highest:ACC.SG.N
<i>parācaír</i> / far.away	<i>ádhārayanta</i> hold:IPRF.MID.3PL	<i>kaváyah</i> sage:NOM.PL.M	
<i>purédám</i> earlier+DEM:ACC.SG.N	/	<i>kṣamédám [= kṣamá idám]</i> earth:INS.SG.F+DEM:ACC.SG.N	<i>anyád</i> other:ACC.SG.N
<i>diví</i> heaven:LOC.SG.M	<i>anyád</i> other:ACC.SG.N	<i>asya</i> DEM:GEN.SG.M	/ <i>sám ī</i> LP NOM.SG.N?
<i>prcyate</i> mix:PASS.3SG	<i>samanéva</i> together+like	<i>ketúḥ</i> beacon:NOM.SG.M	

‘This highest Indrian power of yours did the sage poets hold fast earlier, (the one) far away and this one here—this one here on the earth and the other one of his in heaven. The one (part) is mingled (with the other) equally, like a beacon.’ RV 1.103.1

(588) <i>saṃvatsaré</i> year:LOC.SG.M	<i>vāṃṛdhe</i> grow:PERF.MID.3SG	<i>jagdhám</i> eat:PPP.NOM.SG.N	<i>ī</i> INS.SG.M?	<i>púnah</i> again
------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

‘In a year what was eaten (by him) has grown again.’ RV 1.140.2b

In the first example, *ī* allegedly functions as a nominative. In contrast to Jamison & Brereton (2014: 244), who assume a clause boundary after *diví*, Kupfer (2002: 134) assumes pāda d to constitute a separate clause, the subject of which is *ī*: ‘It is mixed together like (one) light to a whole (burning light)’.⁵⁶⁵ She assumes that *ī* ‘it’ refers to the neuter nouns in the previous pādas or to *anyád*. Contrary to her, Kulikov (2005: 86, 2012: 727f.) argues that since this would be the only attestation of nominative *ī*, it had better be interpreted as an accusative, more precisely an accusative of relation. He translates ‘[This = the two aspects, the earthen and the heavenly ones] is mixed to it (= is mixed, yielding it), as light is mixed to the whole’. Even though the argument that this is the only possible attestation of a nominative *ī* is not compelling due to the low number of attestations, I prefer Kulikov’s assumption that an accusative interpretation is possible. Grassmann (1873: 231f.) interprets *ī* as an accusative too, but as a dual, referring to

⁵⁶⁵ ‘Zusammengemischt wird es wie (ein) Licht zu einem ganzen (sc. brennenden Licht)’.

‘earth’ and ‘heaven’ in the previous pāda.⁵⁶⁶ RIVELEX (II, 245) regards it as a particle in this passage and apparently Jamison & Brereton do so as well. This shows that the interpretation of \bar{i} in this passage is not clear so that I do not include it in my investigation.

In the second example, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 314) supply the agent of the past participle, which is usually expressed by the instrumental, in brackets ‘(by him)’. In contrast, RIVELEX (II, 245) assumes that \bar{i} encodes this agent overtly and therefore assigns it an instrumental function. Moreover, RIVELEX assumes that this is the only passage in the Rigveda where \bar{i} functions as a pronoun, which means that they do not acknowledge an accusative function. Kupfer (2002: 143) appears to interpret \bar{i} as a nominative as well, because she gives this as a passage where $\bar{i}(m)$ refers to a kind of food, which would be *jagdhám* ‘what is eaten’. I do not consider these interpretations to be impossible but at least they are no certain cases of pronominal function. Hence, I exclude this example from my investigation of pronominal \bar{i} as well. Instead, I interpret it as a particle.

With respect to the relation of $\bar{i}m$ and \bar{i} , the synchronic analyses do not agree with each other. Although she assigns it a nominative value in one passage, Kupfer (2002: 128–130) follows Hauri (1963: 81) in assuming that \bar{i} is a phonological variant of $\bar{i}m$ that appears when the preceding word ends in *-m*. In contrast, RIVELEX lists the two forms under different lexemes. Jamison (2002: 309f.) expresses uncertainty about the relation between \bar{i} and $\bar{i}m$.

The fact that $\bar{i}m$, \bar{i} and $s\bar{i}m$ often occur in clauses where an accusative is required leads Jamison (2002), Kupfer (2002) and RIVELEX to follow Grassmann in assuming that they can also have pronominal function in clauses where other accusative forms are present. In these cases, $\bar{i}m$ and $s\bar{i}m$ are especially ambiguous, since they can be either a particle or a co-referential pronoun. Consider the following example:

(589) <i>yád</i>	$\bar{i}m$	<i>índram</i>		<i>śámi</i>		
when	ACC.SG.M	Indra:ACC.SG.M		labor:INS.SG.F		
<i>ṛkṵvāṇa</i>		<i>āśata</i>	/	<i>ād</i>	<i>ín</i>	<i>nāmāni</i>
singing:NOM.PL.M		reach:AOR.MID.3PL		then	PRT	name:ACC.PL.N
<i>yajñíyāni</i>				<i>dadhire</i>		
worthy.of.sacrifice:ACC.PL.N				take:PERF.MID.3PL		

‘When, equipped with chant, they [=Maruts] reached Indra by their labor, just after that they acquired names worthy of the sacrifice.’ RV 1.87.5cd

In this example, $\bar{i}m$ can be regarded as an ACC.SG.M that is coreferential with *índram* or as a particle. RIVELEX (II, 254–263) gives both alternatives. Nevertheless, Jamison (2002: 294;

⁵⁶⁶ Cf. his (1876–1877: II, 103) translation: ‘Theils auf der Erde wirkt sie, theils im Himmel, und beide eint sie, wie des Feuers Banner’.

305) argues that Rigvedic *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* should be analyzed as pronominals in such contexts because of the high frequency with which they occur in contexts that allow an interpretation as accusatives. Including all cases in which *īm* and *sīm* potentially have accusative function, i.e. with or without a coreferential nominal, Jamison (2002: 294–298) observes a distributional difference between the two forms: The distribution of *sīm* with respect to number and gender of its referents is relatively even, apart from a slight tendency towards masculine singular referents, which Jamison attributes to the nature of the Rigveda; in contrast, *īm* refers to masculine singular referents in the vast majority of the attestations (about 125 : 44 cases). On the basis of this observation, she (2002: 298–303) theorizes that *īm* is not an isolated form but the enclitic counterpart to the accusative singular masculine form *imám* of the stressed demonstrative *ayám* (M), *iyám* (F), *idám* (N).

Kupfer (2002: 143–150) investigates several different functions that *īm* may have as a demonstrative. She finds no clear examples of *īm* expressing spatial or temporal deixis. Neither does she find *īm* expressing text deixis, i.e. it does not point to elements in the text as if they were physical entities in the real world; nor does she find it expressing discourse deixis, i.e. when the portion of the text to which it points is in fact not the actual referent; nor does she find *īm* expressing “Deixis am Phantasma”, i.e. when it deictically refers to an entity in the mental image of the speaker as if the hearer were present in the situation that is described. See Himmelmann (1997: 83f.) for more detailed definitions and examples of the terms TEXT DEIXIS, DISCOURSE DEIXIS and DEIXIS AM PHANTASMA. Kupfer also does not detect passages where *īm* refers to the first or second person. She finds *īm* used in contexts of right-dislocation but she does not elaborate what this construction expresses. Moreover, she contends that *īm* does not occur in contrastive focus and does not express contrast with respect to other demonstratives. With respect to definiteness, she gives examples where *īm* exhibits anamnestic and associative-anaphoric use. Note that the examples that she gives for these functions involve other nominals in the accusative. She also finds *īm* with anaphoric and cataphoric use, examples of which I will show in my own analysis. Regarding the anaphoric use; she states that in the majority of cases, it unambiguously refers to an entity within the stanza in which *īm* occurs. There is one passage in which she (2002: 140) identifies *īm* as a correlative pronoun:

(590) <i>yám</i>	<i>ādityā</i>	<i>abhí</i>	<i>druhó</i>	/	<i>rákṣathā</i>
REL:ACC.SG.M	Āditya:VOC.PL.M	LP	deceit:ABL.SG.F		protect:2PL
<i>ném</i> [= <i>ná īm</i>]	<i>aghám</i>		<i>naśad</i>		
NEG+ACC.SG.M	evil:NOM.SG.N		reach:AOR.SBJV.3SG		

‘Whomever you protect from deceit, o Ādityas, evil will not reach **him**.’ RV 8.47.1cd

I consider Kupfer’s analysis of this example plausible, but it is also possible that pāda c constitutes a non-specific free relative clause, in which case a correlative element in the main clause is not to be expected (Haspelmath & König 1995: 577f.). See also Section 4.6.2.1 on this matter.

There is one part of Kupfer’s analysis I would like to discuss specifically here. Kupfer (2002: 147) claims that *īm* exhibits characteristics of a personal pronoun. She justifies this by her observation that it occurs as a bound-variable and expletively, but in the examples that she gives I do not recognize these uses. Consider first the following example:

(591) <i>jāno</i>	<i>yó</i>		<i>mitrāvaruṇāv</i>		<i>abhidhrúg</i>	/
man:NOM.SG.M	REL:NOM.SG.M		Mitra.Varuṇa:VOC.DU.M		inimical:NOM.SG.M	
<i>apó</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>vām</i>	<i>sunóti</i>	<i>akṣṇayādhruk</i>		/
water:ACC.PL.F	like	2DU.DAT	press:3SG	deceiving.crookedly:NOM.SG.M		
<i>svayám sá</i>		<i>yákṣmaṃ</i>	<i>hṛdaye</i>	<i>ní</i>		
himself	DEM:NOM.SG.M	disease:ACC.SG.M	heart:LOC.SG.N	LP		
<i>dhatta</i>	/	<i>āpa</i>	<i>yád īm</i>	<i>hótarābhir</i>		
put:MID.3SG		gain:PERF.3SG	when ACC.SG.N	oblation:INS.PL.F		
<i>ṛtāvā</i>						
truthful:NOM.SG.M						

‘A man who’s a liar, a crooked liar who presses (soma that’s) like water for you two, o Mitra and Varuṇa, he himself installs a wasting disease in his own heart, while the truthful man gains his object through his oblations.’ RV 1.122.9

Following Himmelmann (1996: 212), “3rd person pronouns allow for so-called *pronoun of laziness* (or *bound-variable*) readings where the pronoun acts as a placeholder for its antecedent but does not refer to the same entity as its antecedent”. He exemplifies this by means of the following sentence from Hintikka & Carlson (1977: 16):

(592) *John Doe bequeathed the first house he built to his wife, but Richard Roe deeded it to his daughter.*

In this example, *it* refers to a house, but it is a different one than the one denoted by the antecedent. Following Kupfer (2002: 147), pāda d should be translated as ‘when (the) pious man with (his) invocations reaches it (sc. success)’.⁵⁶⁷ This interpretation would match Himmelmann’s example, if a different (kind of?) success had been mentioned before and *īm* referred to another (kind of?) success. However, in this text passage ‘success’ is not mentioned before, so that I do not understand Kupfer’s analysis. As an example of an expletive use, Kupfer gives the following passage:

(593) <i>sá</i>	<i>īm</i>	<i>spṛdho</i>	<i>vanate</i>
DEM:NOM.SG.M	ACC.PL.F	opponent:ACC.PL.F	vanquish:AOR.SBJ.MID.3SG

⁵⁶⁷ ‘wenn (der) Fromme mit (seinen) Anrufungen **ihn** (sc. **den Erfolg**) erreicht’.

<i>ápratīto</i> unstoppable:NOM.SG.M	/	<i>bíbhrad</i> carry:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.M	<i>vájraṃ</i> mace:ACC.SG.M
<i>vṛtrahánaṃ</i> Vṛtra.smasher:ACC.SG.M		<i>gábhastau</i> fist:LOC.SG.M	

‘Unopposable, he will vanquish the contenders, bearing his Vṛtra-smashing mace in his fist.’ RV 6.20.9ab

Himmelman (1996: 212) regards a pronoun as expletive when it occurs in a sentence like *It is true that we never talked about this before*. However, I would regard *īm* as coreferential with the object ‘the contenders’ in ex. (593) and therefore not regard it as expletive.

With respect to *ī*, Jamison (2002: 305–309) argues that it might be attested more often than it is traditionally considered to be. She assumes that several attestations of *yádī* are not the conjunction *yadi* ‘if’ with a lengthened *-i* but in fact the conjunction *yád* and the pronoun *ī*. As the clearest cases she adduces passages in which both an object is required and a temporal meaning of the conjunction, which *yád* can express, is preferred over a conditional one. She gives the following example:

(594) <i>yádī</i> [= <i>yádi ī</i> ?] when+ACC.SG.M?	<i>mánthanti</i> churn:3PL	<i>bāhúbhīr</i> arm:INS.PL.M	<i>vī</i> LP	<i>rocate</i> shine:MID.3SG	/
<i>ásvo</i> horse:NOM.SG.M	<i>ná</i> like	<i>vājī</i> prizewinning:NOM.SG.M		<i>aruśó</i> red:NOM.SG.M	
<i>váneṣu</i> wood:LOC.PL.N	<i>ā</i> LP				

‘When they churn **him** with their arms, he shines out, like a prizewinning horse, flamed here in the wood. RV 3.29.6ab

I find her line of argumentation very plausible. Nonetheless, as I aim to include only the clearest attestations, I will not include cases like these in my investigation but only those which have doubtlessly been identified as *ī*.⁵⁶⁸

Regarding the usage of *sīm*, Kupfer (2002: 252–260) observes that it occurs with right-dislocation but as with *īm* she does not elaborate on the function of this construction. With respect to definiteness, she finds *sīm* used only with contextual definiteness, i.e. it is used with restrictive relative clauses, anaphorically or cataphorically, anamnestically or space deictically. The anaphoric use she finds mostly with referents in the same stanza and preferably with the one that has been mentioned last. Kupfer (2002: 258) gives one example of an associative-anaphoric use of *sīm*:

(595) <i>túbhyaṃ</i> 2SG.DAT.SG	<i>hinvānó</i> impel:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M	<i>vasiṣṭa</i> clothe:AOR.INJ.MID.3SG
------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------

⁵⁶⁸ Dunkel (2014: 321; 379) considers the emphatic particle **ih₁* as another possible origin for the second syllable of *yádī*.

<i>gā́</i>	<i>apó</i>	/	<i>ádhuḡṣan</i>	<i>sīm</i>	<i>ávibhir</i>
cow:ACC.PL.F	water:ACC.PL.F		milk:AOR.3PL	ACC.SG.M	sheep:INS.PL.M
<i>ádribhir</i>	<i>náraḡ</i>				
stone:INS.PL.M	man:NOM.PL.M				

‘Being impelled for you, it has clothed itself in cows, in waters; the men have milked **it** with the stones through the sheep(’s wool).’ RV 2.36.1ab⁵⁶⁹

Kupfer argues that the identity of the referent of *sīm*, namely soma, has to be inferred from the presence of the words *hinvánás* ‘impelled’, *gā́s* ‘cows’ and *ádhuḡṣan* ‘they milked’ and therefore she analyzes this as a case of associative-anaphoric use. She is correct that the identity of Soma has to be inferred by the context because it has not been mentioned explicitly before. However, she does not consider that soma is already the referent of the null subject in pāda a, so that I characterize the use of *sīm* as anaphoric here. As with *īm*, Kupfer (2002: 258f.) claims that *sīm* can be used as a bound-variable and expletively. Yet, I find the examples that she gives (RV 3.30.14 and 3.2.10) as unconvincing as the ones she gives for *īm* (exx. (591) and (593) above).

Dunkel (1992: 172f.) believes that *sīm* is paradigmatically related to the demonstrative *sá*. Moreover, he detects one passage which he interprets as a remnant of an old nominative use:

(596) <i>etád</i>	<i>asyā́</i>	<i>ánaḡ</i>	<i>śaye</i>	/
DEM:NOM.SG.N	DEM:GEN.SG.F	cart:NOM.SG.N	lie:MID.3SG	
<i>súsampiṣṭam</i>	<i>vípāśi</i>	<i>ā́</i>	<i>sasā́ra</i>	<i>sīm</i>
completely.crushed:NOM.SG.N	Vipāś:LOC.SG.F	LP	run:PERF.3SG	NOM.SG.F?
<i>parāvátah</i>				
distance:ACC.PL.F				

‘This cart of hers lies, very completely crushed, here at the Vipāś (River). She has run into the far distance.’ RV 4.30.11

Dunkel bases his assumption on the fact that translators utilize an intensifier with the subject in pāda c. For instance, Griffith (1896–1897: I, 432) translates ‘And she herself fled far away’. Indeed, an interpretation of *sīm* as an intensifier is justifiable in this context as ‘she herself’ may be interpreted as an alternative to ‘her cart’ (see Section 5.5 on intensifiers). Nevertheless, I do not find this analysis compelling. Firstly, notice that with *parāvátas* ‘into the distance’ an accusative is present, which resembles numerous other passages where *sīm* has been analyzed as an accusative. Secondly, the translation by Jamison & Brereton (2014: 604) shows that an interpretation of *sīm* as an intensifier is not necessary. Thirdly, translations that do involve an

⁵⁶⁹ On *vasiṣṭa* see Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 218) and Jamison (comm.II: ad loc.).

intensifier may also result from a particle interpretation of *sīm* after the predicate rather than an interpretation as a nominative.

In this section, I have given an overview over the results of previous synchronic investigations regarding the pronominal functions of Rigvedic *īm*, *ī* and *sīm*. This overview has shown that several questions regarding their functions still remain unanswered. At the end of her study, Jamison (2002: 309f.) raises the two following questions that she has not been able to answer in her study:

(1) Within the RV I do not understand the relation between *īm* and *ī*. Were these two originally distinct case forms or were they sandhi variants (vel sim.)? The RVic evidence favors the latter view, given the overwhelming predominance of masc. sg. value for both forms. [...]

(2) Also within the RV I do not understand the relation between *sīm* and *īm*. When an enclitic anaphoric masc. acc. sg. pronoun is wanted, why is one chosen over the other? No syntactic, morphological, or phonetic feature that I tested for yielded any results.

In the following sections, I will primarily address these two questions and attempt to identify the conditions under which each of the forms occurs. As a working hypothesis, I will assume that the choice of these forms can be attributed to the prominence of their referents.

6.1.2 The discourse prominence of the referents of *īm*, *ī* and *sīm*

Since previous analyses have not been able to account for the exact distribution of *īm*, *ī*, and *sīm* in the Rigveda I will attempt to carry out an analysis based on the concept of prominence, which provides valuable new insights, among others, on the use of pronouns.

The term PROMINENCE has often been used rather loosely in the linguistic literature. Himmelmann & Primus (2015) see in it a fundamental principle according to which language is organized. They assume that this principle is relevant not only at the level of phonetics and phonology, where it has received the most attention, but also at the level of semantics, morphosyntax and discourse. They (2015: 41f.) explain that a prominent linguistic unit is an “a-centre”, i.e. the “linguistic correspondent” of an entity which is the center of attention. They establish three criteria that define “a-centres” and thus the notion of linguistic prominence:

Firstly, linguistic structures on different levels are organised around a-centres, i.e. units that are selected from among other units of the same type to ‘stand out’ in relation to them. Secondly, a-centering is dynamic and may shift in the running discourse. It is particularly this dynamic trait that sets prominence asymmetries apart from other asymmetries such as markedness and prototypicality. Thirdly, linguistically prominent units serve as structural anchors for their domain. (Himmelmann & Primus 2015: 52f.)

Himmelmann & Primus (2015) concentrate mainly on prosodic prominence and prominence in morphosyntax, more specifically on agent prominence. von Heusinger & Schumacher (2019: 119) apply this concept specifically to the level of discourse and establish the following criteria:

Def.1: Prominence is a relational property that singles out one element from a set of elements of equal type and structure.

Def.2: Prominence status shifts in time (as discourse unfolds).

Def.3: Prominent elements are structural attractors, i.e. they serve as anchors for the larger structures they are constituents of, and they may license more operations than their competitors.

Albeit a general principle, prominence may provide a valuable guide specifically in the endeavor to determine the employment of \bar{im} , \bar{i} and $s\bar{im}$. Jasinskaja et al. (2015: 137) state that the “resolution [of pronouns] to a unique referent relies entirely on the prominence ranking of individuals in the context”. Moreover, Schumacher et al. (2017: 25f.) explain that the prominence of a referent is considered to be reflected by the phonological form of the pronoun, for previous research suggests that reduced pronouns like clitics or even null anaphoras require their referents to be prominent, whereas less reduced forms allow for a lower degree of prominence. According to von Heusinger & Schumacher (2019: 119), this is related to the first criterion of prominence established by Himmelmann & Primus (2015), viz. that it singles out certain elements. The prominence of a referent is perceivable by what von Heusinger & Schumacher (2019: 119) call “prominence-lending cues”, the most important of which include “grammatical function (subject vs. object), topicality (topic vs. non-topic), thematic role (agent vs. patient [...] goal vs. stimulus [, ...] stimulus vs. experiencer [...]) and givenness (where given vs. new should be considered a gradient notion)”. See also the references that they give on these different features. In this section, I will examine whether one of these features can be identified as the determining factor for the choice of either \bar{im} , \bar{i} or $s\bar{im}$. Considering the abovementioned observation regarding the correlation between the prominence of a referent and the phonological form of a pronoun, one should expect that \bar{i} refers to more prominent referents whereas \bar{im} and $s\bar{im}$ encode less prominent referents. However, since all three forms are monosyllabic, phonetically similar clitics, it is also to be expected that if a difference can be detected it will be rather subtle.

Before I begin my analysis, I would like to remind the reader of the interpretational difficulties of the Rigvedic hymns that complicate the analysis of the three forms. A number of text passages have not been interpreted unequivocally in the literature so that the identification of a referent of a pronoun is impossible. Consider the following passage from a riddle song:

(597) <i>ápaśyam</i>	<i>gopām</i>	<i>ánipadyamānam</i>	/	<i>ā</i>	<i>ca</i>
see:IPRF.1SG	herdsman:ACC.SG.M	not.resting:ACC.SG.M		LP	and
<i>pārā</i>	<i>ca</i>	<i>pathibhiś</i>	<i>cárantam</i>	/[.../...] //	
LP	and	path:INS.PL.M	move:PTCP.PRS.ACC.SG.M		
<i>yá</i>	<i>īm</i>	<i>cakāra</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>só</i>	
REL:NOM.SG.M	ACC.SG.M	do:PERF.3SG	NEG	DEM:NOM.SG.M	
<i>asyá</i>	<i>veda</i>	/	<i>yá</i>	<i>īm</i>	<i>dadárśa</i>
DEM:GEN.SG.M	know:PERF.3SG		REL:NOM.SG.M	ACC.SG.M	see:PERF.3SG

hírug ín nú tásmāt
away PRT now DEM:ABL.SG.M

‘31. I saw the herdsman who never settles down, roaming here and afar along his paths.
[...]

32. He who created **him** does not know him. He is far away from him who has seen **him**.’
RV 1.164.31–32b

As possible referents of stanza 1 Witzel & Gotō (2007: 742) name the breath of life or wind or the sun. As possible referents of stanza 2, i.e. of *īm* they name again the breath of life/wind or sun, but also lightning. As a result, this passage is ineligible for an investigation of the function of *īm*. In my investigation, I will therefore only include those cases in which the referent of the pronouns is clear. For *īm*, I find 50 such cases. For *ī*, the referent is clear in both cases where I identify it as a pronoun. For *sīm*, I find 11 cases in which I consider its referent to be clear. The three forms under investigation are all the more problematic because they can refer to all numbers and genders, so that even in a passage that is apparently clear, other interpreters might come to different results than mine. Therefore, the numbers that I give in this section should only be taken as approximate.

I will start my investigation by examining the first prominence-lending feature, viz. grammatical function. Following Jasinskaja et al. (2015: 138), for referents that are the subject of one clause there is a higher probability that they will be encoded by a pronoun in a following clause than for those that are non-subjects. This might also determine the use of the three pronominal forms under investigation. The form *īm* encodes referents that are realized as the subject (ex. (598)), the object (ex. (599)) or an adjunct (ex. (600)) in the preceding clause:

(598) *sám tã índro asṛjad asya*
LP DEM:ACC.PL.F Indra:NOM.SG.M drive:IPRF.3SG DEM:GEN.SG.M
śākaír / yád īm sómāsaḥ
strong:INS.PL.M when ACC.SG.M Soma:NOM.PL.M
súṣutā ámandan
well.pressed:NOM.PL.M exhilarate:IPRF.3PL

‘Along with his powerful (men) Indra drove them together, when the well-pressed soma drinks exhilarated **him**.’ RV 5.30.10cd

(599) *yé vājīnam paripásyanti pakvám /*
REL:NOM.PL.M prizewinner:ACC.SG.M LP.see:3PL cooked:ACC.SG.M
yá īm āhúḥ surabhír
REL:NOM.PL.M ACC.SG.M say:PERF.3PL sweet.smelling:NOM.SG.M
nír haréti
LP take:IMP.2SG+QUOT

‘Those who inspect the prizewinner when cooked and who say **about him**: “It smells good! Take it off (the fire)!”’ RV 1.162.12ab

(600) <i>prá</i>	<i>vo</i>	<i>mahé</i>	[.../...]/	<i>stómo</i>	
LP	2PL.GEN	great:DAT.SG.M		praise:NOM.SG.M	
<i>babhūtu</i>		<i>agnáye</i>	/	<i>práti yád īm</i>	
become:PERF.IMP.3SG		Agni:DAT.SG.M		LP when ACC.SG.M	
<i>havíṣmān</i>		/	<i>viśvāsu</i>	<i>kṣāsu</i>	<i>jóguve</i> /
with.oblation:NOM.SG.M			every:LOC.PL.F	land:LOC.PL.F	call:INT.MID.3SG
<i>ágre</i>		<i>rebhó</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>jarata</i>	<i>ṛṣūñám</i>
foremost:LOC.SG.N		creaking:NOM.SG.M	like	sing:MID.3SG	ray:GEN.PL.M

‘Let your (praise) (stand) out for the great one [...]—let (your) praise stand (out) for Agni. When someone with an oblation is calling on **him** in all the lands, in advance of (dawn’s) rays he “sings” [=crackles] like a hoarse-voiced (singer)’ RV 1.127.10a–f

I count 17 cases in which *īm* refers to the subject and 14 cases in which it refers to the accusative object of the previous clause. In 9 cases, it refers to a previous adjunct.⁵⁷⁰ Like *īm*, *sīm* encodes referents that are realized as the subject (ex. (601)) or the object of the preceding clause (ex. (602)). However, I do not find a clear case where *sīm* refers to an adjunct of the predicate. Nevertheless, it can refer to elements that are not arguments in the previous clause, e.g. a genitive attribute (ex. (603)):

(601) <i>áthā</i>	<i>yuvām</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>ahvayat</i>	<i>púramdhir</i>	/	<i>ágachatam</i>
and	2DU.ACC	PRT	call:IPRF.3SG	Plenty:NOM.SG.F		LP.go:IPRF.2DU
<i>sīm</i>	<i>vṛṣaṇāv</i>		<i>ávobhiḥ</i>			
ACC.SG.F	bull:VOC.DU.M		help:INS.PL.N			

‘And so Plenty called upon just you two, and you two came to **her** with your help, o bulls.’ 1.117.19cd

(602) <i>śrutám</i>		<i>me</i>	<i>mitrāvaruṇā</i>		
hear:AOR.IMP.2DU		1SG.GEN	Mitra.Varuṇa:VOC.DU.M		
<i>hávemā</i>		/	<i>utá</i>	<i>śrutam</i>	<i>sádane</i>
call:ACC.PL.N+DEM:ACC.PL.N			and	hear:AOR.IMP.2DU	seat:LOC.SG.N
<i>viśvátaḥ</i>	<i>sīm</i>				
all.around	ACC.PL.N				

‘Hear these calls of mine, Mitra and Varuṇa, and hear **them** in your seat on all sides.’ RV 1.122.6ab

(603) <i>tuvám</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>vṛtrahantama</i>	/		
2SG.NOM	1PL.DAT	best.smashing.obstacles:VOC.SG.M			
<i>índrasyendo</i> [=índrasya indo]		<i>śívah</i>		<i>sákhā</i>	/
Indra:GEN.SG.M+drop:VOC.SG.M		friendly:NOM.SG.M		comrade:NOM.SG.M	
<i>yát</i>	<i>sīm</i>	<i>hávante</i>	<i>samithé</i>		
when	ACC.SG.M	call:MID.3PL	conflict:LOC.SG.N		

⁵⁷⁰ Note that it is not always easy to decide whether an accusative is to be analyzed as a direct object or as an adjunct of the predicate.

‘O drop that best smashes obstacles, you are for us Indra’s benevolent comrade, when they call upon **him** in the conflict’ RV 10.25.9a–c

I find 4 passages in which *sīm* refers to the previous subject and one case in which it refers to the previous object. In the first case of pronominal *ī*, the referent is the object of the preceding main clause and an adjunct, encoded by the relative pronoun, in the relative clause which immediately precedes the clause in which *ī* occurs. In the second case, the referent is the object of the preceding clause:

(604) <i>pári</i>	<i>dyukṣám</i>	<i>sáhasaḥ</i>	<i>parvatāvṛdham</i>	/	
LP	heavenly:ACC.SG.M	strength:GEN.SG.N	grown.strong.on.mountain:ACC.SG.M		
<i>mádhvaḥ</i>	<i>siñcanti</i>	[...]	<i>á</i>	<i>yásmin</i>	<i>gávah</i>
sweet:GEN.SG.N	sprinkle:3PL		LP	REL:LOC.SG.M	cow:NOM.PL.F
<i>śuhutáda</i>		<i>údhani</i>	/	<i>mūrdháñ</i>	
eating.good.oblations:DAT.SG.M		udder:LOC.SG.N		head:LOC.SG.M	
<i>chrīṇánti</i>	<i>agriyám</i>	<i>várīmabhiḥ</i>	//	<i>sám</i>	<i>ī</i>
mix:3PL	foremost:ACC.SG.N	broad:INS.PL.N		LP	ACC.SG.M
<i>ráthaṃ</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>bhurījor</i>		<i>aheṣata</i>	
chariot:ACC.SG.M	like	hand:LOC.DU.F		assemble:AOR.MID.3PL	
<i>dása</i>	<i>svásāro</i>	<i>áditer</i>		<i>upásta</i>	<i>á</i>
ten:NOM	sister:NOM.PL.F	Aditi:GEN.SG.F		lap:LOC.SG.M	LP

‘4. All around they sprinkle the heaven-ruling (son) of strength, of honey, grown strong upon the mountain [...], in whom, on whose head, the cows prepare the foremost (milk) in their udder in broad (streams) for him who eats the good oblation [=Indra].

5. The ten sisters on the two hands have assembled **him** like a chariot, here in the lap of Aditi.’ RV 9.71.4–5b

(605) <i>aṃśúm</i>	<i>duhanti</i>	<i>stanáyantam</i>		
plant:ACC.SG.M	milk:3PL	thunder:PTCP.PRS.ACT.ACC.SG.M		
<i>ákṣitam</i>	/ <i>kavīm</i>	<i>kaváyo</i>		<i>apáso</i>
undecaying:ACC.SG.M	poet:ACC.SG.M	poet:NOM.PL.M		active:NOM.PL.M
<i>manīśīṇaḥ</i>	/ <i>sám</i>	<i>ī</i>	<i>gávo</i>	<i>matáyo</i>
inspired:NOM.PL.M	LP	ACC.SG.M	cow:NOM.PL.F	thought:NOM.PL.F
<i>yanti</i>	<i>saṃyáta</i>	/ <i>ṛtásya</i>		<i>yónā</i>
go:3PL	uninterrupted:NOM.PL.F	truth:GEN.SG.N		womb:LOC.SG.M
<i>sádane</i>	<i>punarbhúvaḥ</i>			
seat:LOC.SG.N	renewed:NOM.PL.F			

‘They milk the thundering, imperishable plant; the industrious inspired poets (milk) the poet. The cows and the thoughts in uninterrupted array, ever regenerating, go together to **him** in the womb, the seat of truth.’ RV 9.72.6

A further factor that I can exclude here is the grammatical function of the forms in the clause where they occur. As I have outlined, I regard all three pronominal forms as accusatives, which means that they cannot function as subjects. It is, however, important to consider that in Vedic

the accusative is not only used to encode the direct object but can also be used as a semantic case, e.g. expressing temporal extension. In this case, it would fulfill the syntactic function of an adjunct. There is no clear case in which one of the forms occurs as an adjunct. For *īm*, this is possible in the following text passage:

(606) *ā́* *gachantīm* [= *gachanti īm*] *ávasā* *citrábhānavah*
 LP go:3PL+ACC.SG.M help:INS.SG.N with.bright.radiance:NOM.PL.M

‘They come hither **to him** with help—they of bright radiance.’ RV 1.85.11c⁵⁷¹

The verb *gám-* ‘go’ with the local particle *ā́* means ‘come here’ and does not necessarily take a direct object (Grassmann 1873: 379), which speaks against a function of *īm* as a direct object. However, with an additional accusative this complex verb also means ‘come to’ and does not necessarily have the meaning component ‘here’. This justifies the assumption that *īm* functions as an accusative here but it also raises the question of whether *īm* should be analyzed as a direct object. Kulikov (2012: 734) ranks *ā́* rather low on the hierarchy of transitivizing local particles in Sanskrit (see also the references that he gives in his note 6).

As for *ī*, in ex. (604) it is the object of its clause and one may say the same in ex. (605). The previous examples show that neither the grammatical role of a referent in the clause in which the pronouns occur nor its role in the previous clause seems to be the determining factor for the choice of the three forms. In ex. (602), the employment of *sīm* as an object is observable, whereas ex. (601) is comparable to ex. (606).

A further prominence-lending feature that von Heusinger & Schumacher (2019) name is the thematic role of a referent in the previous clause, and according to Schumacher et al. (2016: 236) “thematic role information is a highly ranked predictor” with respect to pronoun resolution. I will first examine the difference between agents and patients. Following Dowty (1991: 572), a prototypical agent can be defined by means of the following four features: VOLITION, SENTIENCE, CAUSATION and AUTONOMOUS MOVEMENT; for a proto-patient he gives the four features CHANGE OF STATE, INCREMENTAL THEME, CAUSAL AFFECTEDNESS, and STATIONARITY (see also Primus 2009: 266f.).⁵⁷² Determining the semantic role of a referent is not always easy in the Rigveda, because the exact meaning of verbs is often unclear and the interpretations may differ considerably. Consider the following example:

(607) *mā́* *svádhitis* *tanvā* *ā́* *tiṣṭhipat*
 NEG axe:NOM.SG.F body:ACC.PL.F LP stand:CAUS.AOR.INJ.3SG

⁵⁷¹ Jamison (comm.I.1: ad loc.) suggests resolving the sandhi *gachantīm* as *gachant īm*.

⁵⁷² As a possible fifth agentivity feature, Dowty mentions the independent existence of the actant. Accordingly, he considers it as a possible feature of a proto-patient if the actant has no independent existence. In contrast, Primus (2012: 25f.) contemplates the ability to assume the role of a possessor as a further possible feature. I will only operate with the first four features.

te

2SG.GEN

‘let the axe not **bring** the parts of your body **to a standstill**’ (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 346)

‘Let not the axe **do lasting harm** to your body.’ (Doniger O’Flaherty 1981: 91) RV 1.162.20b

In this passage, several translations assign the predicate *ā tiṣṭhipat* a meaning like ‘do lasting harm’ whereas Jamison (comm.I.2: ad loc.) prefers the more literal meaning ‘make stand still’.⁵⁷³ For my analysis, I will therefore attempt to give examples that are as clear as possible and I will not give numbers regarding semantic roles. In spite of the difficulty to identify semantic roles, the following two examples show that *īm* refers both to previous agents and previous patients:

(608) *ādhā* *vṛtrāya* *prā* *vadhām* *jabhāra* /
then Vṛtra:DAT.SG.M LP deadly.weapon:ACC.SG.M carry:PERF.3SG
mīhaṃ *vāsāna* *úpa* *hīm [= hí īm]*
mist:ACC.SG.F put.on:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M LP for+ACC.SG.M
ādudrot
run:AOR.3SG

‘Then he bore his murderous weapon down toward Vṛtra. Clothing himself in mist, he [=Vṛtra] ran up to **him**.’ RV 2.30.3bc

(609) *ṛtīyam* *asya* *vṛṣabhāsya* *dohāse* /
third:ACC.SG.N DEM:GEN.SG.M bull:GEN.SG.M milk:INF.DAT.SG
dāśapramatiṃ *janayanta* *yōṣaṇaḥ* //
of.tenfold.forethought:ACC.SG.M beget:INJ.MID.3PL young.woman:NOM.PL.F
nír *yád* *īm* *budhnān* *mahiśāsya*
LP when ACC.SG.M depth:ABL.SG.M buffalo:GEN.SG.M
várpasa / *īśānāsaḥ* *śávasā*
form:ABL.SG.N be.master:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.PL.M power:INS.SG.N
kránta *sūrāyaḥ*
do:AOR.INJ.MID.3PL patron:NOM.PL.M

‘His third (wondrous form, that) of the bull to be milked, have the young women begotten—him of tenfold forethought.

3. When the patrons, showing mastery through their power, bring **him** forth from the depth, from the form of a buffalo’ RV 1.141.2c–3b

Ex. (608) is about the battle between Indra, who is the referent of *īm* and the null subject of the previous clause, and Vṛtra (Jamison & Brereton 2014: 444; Jamison comm.II: ad loc). This context suggests that the predicate ‘bore down’ requires volition, sentience and autonomous movement. Moreover, Indra causes the weapon to go down on Vṛtra. As a result, I consider

⁵⁷³ On the ambiguity of the object see Witzel & Gotō (2007: 730).

Indra to be a prototypical agent in pāda b. The opposite is the case in ex. (609). There, Agni, who is the referent of *īm*, is the effected object of the previous clause. He undergoes a change of state from non-existent to existent, is causally affected, or rather effected, by the young women and is probably stationary with respect to them, although fire always exhibits some degree of movement. It is difficult to tell whether Agni is an incremental theme, i.e. an object whose degree of affectedness corresponds to the progress of the event. Nevertheless, he is fairly close to being a prototypical patient.

For *sīm* the situation is different. Here I find cases in which *sīm* refers to typical agents but none with typical patients:

(610) <i>ájohavīd</i> call:INT.IPRF.3SG	<i>aśvinā</i> Aśvin:VOC.DU.M	<i>vártikā</i> quail.hen:NOM.SG.F	<i>vām</i> / 2DU.ACC
<i>āsnó</i> mouth:ABL.SG.N	<i>yát sīm</i> when ACC.SG.F	<i>ámuñcatam</i> free:IPRF.2DU	<i>vṛkasya</i> wolf:GEN.SG.M

‘The quail-hen called upon you again and again, Aśvins, so that you freed **her** from the mouth of the wolf.’ RV 1.117.16ab

The verb *hū-* ‘call’ is also used with human subjects so that one can assume that it involves volition here. Moreover, it requires the subject to be sentient and the act of calling also involves physical motion (e.g. of the beak and the vocal chords). With respect to causation, one can say that the quail-hen is the causer of the event but that the other actant is not causally affected by her action.

It is noteworthy that both *īm* and *sīm* are attested referring to actants of the previous clause that share fewer features with prototypical patients:

(611) <i>yó</i> REL:NOM.SG.M	<i>asmai</i> DEM:DAT.SG.M	<i>havyaír</i> oblation:INS.PL.N	<i>ghṛtávadhbhir</i> with.ghee:INS.PL.N
<i>ávidhat</i> worship:AOR.3SG	/ <i>prá</i> LP	<i>tám</i> DEM:ACC.SG.M	<i>prācā</i> forward
<i>bráhmaṇas</i> formulation:GEN.SG.N	<i>pátih</i> lord:NOM.SG.M	/ <i>uruśyátim</i> [= <i>uruśyāti īm</i>] make.space:3SG+ACC.SG.M	<i>nayati</i> lead:3SG
<i>ámhaso</i> strait:GEN.SG.N	<i>rákṣatī</i> protect:3SG	<i>riśó</i> harm:ABL.SG.F	

‘Whoever has done honor to him with ghee-drenched oblations, that one does the lord of the sacred formulation lead to the fore. He makes a wide place **for him** from narrow straits; he protects him from harm’ RV 2.26.4a–c⁵⁷⁴

(612) <i>bhúvas</i> become:AOR.SBJV.2SG	<i>tásya</i> DEM:GEN.SG.M	<i>svátavāṃḥ</i> self.powerful:NOM.SG.M
--------------------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------------------

⁵⁷⁴ Jamison (comm.II: ad loc.) assumes *rákṣatī*, whose long *ī* is otherwise unexplained, to be a contraction of *rákṣati ī*.

(615) <i>imā</i>	<i>indraṃ</i>	<i>vāruṇam</i>	<i>me</i>
DEM:NOM.PL.F	Indra:ACC.SG.M	Varuṇa:ACC.SG.M	1SG.GEN
<i>manīṣā</i>	/	<i>ágmān</i>	<i>úpa dráviṇam</i>
thought:NOM.PL.F		go:IPRF.3PL	LP good:ACC.SG.N
<i>ichámānāḥ</i>	/	<i>úpem [= úpa īm]</i>	<i>asthur</i>
seek:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.PL.M		LP+ACC.DU.M	stand:AOR.3PL
<i>joṣṭāra</i>	<i>iva</i>	<i>vásvo</i>	
enjoyer:NOM.PL.M	like	good:GEN.SG.N	

‘These inspired thoughts of mine have come up to Indra and Varuṇa, seeking material goods. Like those who enjoy a good thing, they have approached **them**’ RV 4.41.9a–c

In ex. (613), *īm* in pāda b picks up the demonstrative *asyá*, which can be analyzed as the stimulus of the previous clause. In ex. (614), *īm* refers to *devás* ‘the gods’, who are the experiencers of the previous clause. Indra and Varuṇa are the goal of the movement of the inspired thoughts in ex. (615) and *īm* refers to them in the following clause.

I find no clear case where *sīm* refers to a previous experiencer or to a source or a goal. It is, however, attested with a stimulus (ex. (602)). As exx. (604) and (605) are the only clear examples of pronominal *ī*, there are no attestations of it referring to previous experiencers or stimuli or to sources or goals.

What might also be relevant is the thematic role that the referent of *īm*, *ī* or *sīm*, respectively, fulfills in the clause in which the pronoun occurs. The Pronoun *īm* can refer to prototypical patients, as the following example shows:

(616) <i>té</i>	<i>siyāma</i>	<i>yé</i>	<i>agnáye</i>	/
DEM:NOM.PL.M	be:OPT.1PL	REL:NOM.PL.M	Agni:DAT.SG.M	
<i>dadāśúr</i>	<i>havyádātibhiḥ</i>	/	<i>yá</i>	<i>īm</i>
serve:PERF.3PL	giving.oblations:INS.PL.F		REL:NOM.PL.M	ACC.SG.M
<i>púśyanta</i>	<i>indhaté</i>			
thrive:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.PL.M	kindle:MID.3PL			

‘May we, who have done pious service for Agni by giving oblations, be those who, thriving, kindle **him**.’ RV 4.8.5

By being kindled, the fire (Agni) comes into being so that I consider it is an effected object and a prototypical patient (cp. ex. (609) above). Ex. (614) above shows *īm* referring to a non-prototypical patient. Moreover, *īm* can refer to stimuli (ex. (613) above) and experiencers (ex. (598) above) as well as to goals (ex. (606) above); I find no clear case where it refers to a source. Likewise, *sīm* can refer to prototypical patients (ex. (618) below) and to less prototypical patients (ex. (612) above); moreover, it refers to stimuli (ex. (602) above) and in ex. (619) below its referent may be analyzed as an experiencer; *sīm* can refer to a goal (ex. (601) above) but I

find no clear case where it refers to a source. In ex. (604), *ī* refers to a non-prototypical patient and in ex. (605) to a goal.

In addition to thematic roles, von Heusinger & Schumacher (2019: 119) also mention topicality as an important prominence-lending cue. Remember that with Lambrecht (1994: 118) I define the topic as the referent which a proposition is about. As I explained in Section 6.1.1, the nature of the Rigveda makes it exceedingly difficult to assign information-structural properties to referents in the Rigveda. Even though authors like Schnaus & Mull (2016) and Lühr (2018a) do analyze information structure in the Rigveda, Keydana & Luraghi (2012: 125) explain that “[t]he texts hardly ever contain explicit narratives. Events are often only alluded to, and the context is either absent or very sketchy. This makes it nearly impossible to give a reliable analysis of the information structure of a given hymn”.⁵⁷⁵ As a result, I refrain from giving any numbers regarding the ratio of *īm*, *sīm* and *ī* referring to topics or non-topics, because such an analysis would not be reliable. Attempting to find examples that are as clear as possible again, I assume that the pronoun *īm* can be used to encode referents that occur as topics or non-topics in the previous clause:

(617) <i>áchā</i>	<i>nṛcáksā</i>		<i>asarat</i>	<i>pavítre</i>	/
LP	looking.at.men:NOM.SG.M		run:AOR.3SG	filter:LOC.SG.N	
<i>nāma</i>	<i>dádhānaḥ</i>		<i>kavír</i>	<i>asya</i>	
name:ACC.SG.N	take:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M		poet:NOM.SG.M	DEM:GEN.SG.M	
<i>yónau</i>	/	<i>sídān</i>		<i>hóteva</i>	
womb:LOC.SG.M		sit:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.M		Hotar:NOM.SG.M+like	
<i>sádane</i>	<i>camúṣu</i>	/	<i>úpem [= úpa īm]</i>	<i>agmann</i>	
seat:LOC.SG.N	cup:LOC.PL.F		LP+ACC.SG.M	go:AOR.3SG	
<i>śṣayaḥ</i>	<i>saptá</i>		<i>víprāḥ</i>		
seer:NOM.PL.M	seven.NOM		inspired:NOM.PL.M		

‘His gaze on men, he has run here, acquiring the name “poet” in the filter, in his womb, taking his seat in the cups, like a Hotar on his seat. The seven inspired seers have approached **him**.’ RV 9.92.2

This example is from a hymn dedicated to soma, who is the subject in pādas a–c. These pādas describe the actions of soma, i.e. provide information about him. I therefore consider soma to be the topic here. For *īm* referring to a previous non-topic see again ex. (599) above. There, one probably cannot say that the preceding relative clause is about the prizewinner.

Similar to *īm*, I assume that *sīm* refers both to previous topics and to previous non-topics, as the following examples show:

⁵⁷⁵ My investigation of the particles *cid* and *id* has also shown that in many cases it is difficult to determine what exactly the focus of a particle is.

(618) <i>túbhyaṃ</i>	<i>hinvāno</i>		<i>vasiṣṭa</i>		
2SG.DAT.SG	impel:PTCP.PRS.MID.NOM.SG.M		clothe:INJ.AOR.MID.3SG		
<i>gā</i>	<i>apó</i>	/	<i>ádhuṣan</i>	<i>sīm</i>	<i>ávibhir</i>
cow:ACC.PL.F	water:ACC.PL.F		milk:AOR.3PL	ACC.SG.M	sheep:INS.PL.M
<i>ádribhir</i>	<i>náraḥ</i>				
stone:INS.PL.M	man:NOM.PL.M				

‘Being impelled for you, it has clothed itself in cows, in waters; the men have milked **it** with the stones through the sheep(’s wool).’ RV 2.36.1ab

(619) <i>tuvám</i>	<i>no</i>	<i>vṛtrahantama</i>	/		
2SG.NOM	1PL.DAT	best.smashing.obstacles:VOC.SG.M			
<i>índrasyendo</i> [=índrasya indo]		<i>śívāḥ</i>		<i>sákhā</i>	/
Indra:GEN.SG.M+drop:VOC.SG.M		friendly:NOM.SG.M		comrade:NOM.SG.M	
<i>yát</i>	<i>sīm</i>	<i>hávante</i>	<i>samithé</i>		
when	ACC.SG.M	call:MID.3PL	conflict:LOC.SG.N		

‘O drop that best smashes obstacles, you are for us Indra’s benevolent comrade, when they call upon **him** in the conflict’ RV 10.25.9a–c

Ex. (618) informs Indra that the soma, which is the referent of the null subject in the first clause and of *īm* in the second one, is ready for him. Therefore, the first clause can be assumed to convey information about soma. Ex. (619) is taken from a hymn dedicated to soma, who is the addressee of the second person pronoun *tvám* ‘you’. In contrast to soma, Indra, who is the referent of *sīm*, is mentioned for the first time in this hymn in pāda b as an adjunct. Hence, I assume that Indra is not the topic of the main clause in pādas a/b. Nevertheless, he is referred to by *sīm* in the following subclause.

A further factor that might play a role in the choice of the pronoun and has been associated with prominence is the animacy of the referent (Aissen 2003: 436f.). Thus, topics are usually animate (von Heusinger & Schumacher 2019: 124). The referents of *īm* can be humans/gods (ex. (620)), animals (ex. (621)) and possibly also inanimate entities (ex. (622)) (cf. Kupfer 2002: 143):

(620) <i>utá</i>	<i>tyám</i>	<i>bhujyúm</i>	<i>aśvinā</i>		
and	DEM:ACC.SG.M	Bhujyu:ACC.SG.M	Aśvin:VOC.DU.M		
<i>sákhāyo</i>	/	<i>mádhye</i>	<i>jahur</i>		
companion:NOM.PL.M		middle:LOC.SG.M	abandon:PERF.3PL		
<i>durévāsaḥ</i>	<i>samudré</i>	/	<i>nír</i>	<i>īm</i>	<i>parśad</i>
evil.minded:NOM.PL.M	sea:LOC.SG.M		LP	ACC.SG.M	protect:AOR.SBJV.3SG
<i>árāvā</i>	<i>yó</i>		<i>yuvākuḥ</i>		
enemy:NOM.SG.M	REL:NOM.SG.M		seeking.you:NOM.SG.M		

‘And again, Aśvins, his companions of evil intent abandoned this Bhujyu in the middle of the sea. His enemy [=Tugra], who seeks you, will rescue **him**.’ RV 7.68.7

(621) *úpo* *nayasva* *vṛṣaṇā* *tapuṣpā* /
 LP+PRT lead:IMP.MID.2SG bullish:ACC.DU.M protecting.from.heat:NOM.SG.M
utém [= *utá īm*] *ava* *tvám* *vṛṣabha*
 and+ACC.DU.M help:IMP.2SG 2SG.NOM bull:VOC.SG.M
svadhāvaḥ
 independent:VOC.SG.M

‘Lead near the two bullish (stallions), protecting them from the scorching heat, and help **them**—you autonomous bull.’ RV 3.35.3ab

(622) *kó* *asyá* *veda* *prathamásya*
 who:NOM.SG.M DEM:GEN.SG.N know:PERF.3SG first:GEN.SG.N
áhnaḥ / *ká* *īm* *dadarśa*
 day:GEN.SG.N who:NOM.SG.M ACC.SG.N see:PERF.3SG

‘Who knows about this first day? Who has seen **it**’ RV 10.10.6ab⁵⁷⁶

The following examples show that a similar circumstance can be observed for *sīm* (cf. Kupfer 2002: 255). In ex. (623) it refers to the gods, and in ex. (624) to cows:⁵⁷⁷

(623) *mahó* *devān* *yájasi* [... / ...] / *arvācaḥ*
 great:ACC.PL.M god:ACC.PL.M sacrifice:2SG towards.here:ACC.PL.M
sīm *kṛṇuhi* *agne* *ávase*
 ACC.PL.M do:IMP.2SG Agni:VOC.SG.M help:DAT.SG.N

‘You sacrifice to the great gods [...]. Bring **them** nearby for help, Agni.’ RV 6.48.4a–c

(624) *indrāya* *gāva* *āśíram* / *duduhré*
 Indra:DAT.SG.M cow:NOM.PL.F milk:ACC.SG.F milk:PERF.MID.3PL
vajríṇe *mádhu* / *yát* *sīm*
 with.mace:DAT.SG.M sweet:ACC.SG.N because ACC.PL.F
upahvaré *vidát*
 remote.place:LOC.SG.M find:AOR.INJ.3SG

‘The cows have milked out the milk-mixture for Indra, the honey for the mace-bearer, since he found **them** in the remote place.’ RV 8.69.6

Whereas the preceding passages are clear examples of *sīm* referring to gods and animals, examples with inanimate entities are less clear. Consider ex. (602) above. There, *sīm* refers to ‘my calls’, which per se are inanimate but they can also be interpreted as metonymically referring to the person who calls. Similar unclarities exist for the two instances of pronominal *ī*. Both refer to soma and it is not entirely clear, whether it is conceptualized as inanimate or as a deity. However, since both instances occur in hymns dedicated to soma it is probably thought

⁵⁷⁶ Note that in this passage, Schneider (1967–1968: 4) and Schnaus (2008: 175f.) disagree with the other translators and assume that *asyá* ‘of this’ in pāda a is not coreferential with *prathamásya áhnas* ‘first day’ but refers to the statement in the previous stanza. This would mean that the referent of *īm* is unclear. However, Bodewitz (2009: 267) convincingly argues against this interpretation (cf. Pinault 2012: 153).

⁵⁷⁷ According to Kupfer (2002: 143; 255), *sīm* does not refer to places whereas *īm* does. Moreover, whereas she finds clear examples of *īm* referring to mass nouns, those mass nouns to which *sīm* refers might also be personifications.

of as a deity and therefore animate. Due to such uncertainties, it would also be misleading to give any numbers regarding this parameter. For as the case of *soma* shows, entities that are actually inanimate may be conceptualized as deities. For instance, *ágni-* may refer to fire but also to the fire god Agni. Kupfer (2002: 255) points out as well that mass nouns may be interpreted as personifications.

Thus far, I have mostly considered text passages in which the referent appears in the clause that immediately precedes the one which contains the pronoun. It may be interesting to examine whether the distance between *īm*, and *sīm* and the last mention of the referent plays a role for their employment. Based on Chafe (1987: 25–36), Lambrecht (1994: 93–96) distinguishes between three activation states, viz. active, accessible/semi-active and inactive. Chafe (1987: 25) defines these states in the following way:⁵⁷⁸

An active concept is one that is currently lit up, a concept in a person’s focus of consciousness. A semi-active concept is one that is in a person’s peripheral consciousness, a concept of which a person has a background awareness, but which is not being directly focused on. An inactive concept is one that is currently in a person’s long-term memory, neither focally nor peripherally active.

With respect to this, von Heusinger & Schumacher (2019: 122) explain that the notion of activation is not essentially different from their concept of discourse prominence. Thus, they say that a referent that is more active than another one is also more prominent and argue that activation can be defined by means of the first two of their criteria of prominence, i.e. competition of equal units and dynamicity within discourse. The previous examples in this section have shown that *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* all are used for active referents, for in the examples the referents are mentioned in the previous clauses. For *īm* and *ī*, I have found no clear case where their referent is not active. For *sīm*, there is in fact one case in which its referent is inactive. However, it differs from all examples discussed above because the pronoun is used cataphorically:

(625) <i>prá</i>	<i>sīm</i>	<i>ādityó</i>	<i>asṛjad</i>	<i>vidhartām̃</i>	/
LP	ACC.PL.M	Āditya:NOM.SG.M	send:IPRF.3SG	distributor:NOM.SG.M	
<i>ṛtām̃</i>	<i>síndhavo</i>	<i>váruṇasya</i>	<i>yanti</i>		
truth:ACC.SG.N	river:NOM.PL.M	Varuṇa:GEN.SG.M	go:3PL		

‘As their distributor, the Āditya sent **them** gushing forth: the rivers move to the truth of Varuṇa.’ RV 2.28.4ab

Apart from this example, I have not found any cases where *sīm* occurs far apart from its referent.⁵⁷⁹ In the two cases of pronominal *ī*, its referent is active.

⁵⁷⁸ Lambrecht (1994: 94) also quotes Chafe for this definition.

⁵⁷⁹ An employment of *īm* that is comparable to that of *sīm* in ex. (625) might be present in RV 6.3.6c. However, as the relative clause does not contain an overt predicate, I consider this passage to be unclear. See Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 371) and Jamison (comm.VI.1: ad loc.) on this passage.

Concepts that are related to the notions of activation and discourse prominence are the Givenness Hierarchy by Gundel et al. (1993) and the Accessibility Hierarchy by Ariel (1990, 2001). The former states that all pronouns can encode a referent that “is represented in current short-term memory” but that only a referent that is “not only in short-term memory, but is also at the current center of attention” can be encoded by an unstressed pronoun (Gundel et al. 1993: 278f.). Similarly, the latter hierarchy states with respect to pronouns that the referents of cliticized pronouns like English *ya* are more accessible than those of unstressed pronouns; those of unstressed pronouns are more accessible than those of stressed pronouns (+ gesture); and those of stressed pronouns are again more accessible than those of demonstrative pronouns. Ariel (2001: 34) explains that the “[d]egree of accessibility depends on factors related to the inherent salience of the entity and on the unity between the antecedent and the anaphor”. As a major difference to the concept of discourse prominence, von Heusinger & Schumacher (2019: 123) name the fact that these hierarchies “are basically static and non-relational”. With respect to the Rigvedic data, it can be seen that the use of *sīm* in ex. (625) appears to violate these hierarchies. However, the pronoun is used cataphorically there. For *īm*, there is one example which at first sight appears to violate the hierarchies:

(626) *úpa prá jinvann uśatīr uśántam / pátiṃ ná nítyaṃ jánayaḥ sánīlāḥ / svásāraḥ śyāvīm áruṣīm ajuśrañ / citrám uchántīm uśasaṃ ná gāvāḥ // vīlú cid dīlhá pitáro na ukthair / ádriṃ rujann áṅgirasó ráveṇa / cakrúr divó bṛható gātúm asmé / áhaḥ súvar vividuḥ ketúm usrāḥ // dádhan ṛtām dhanáyann asya dhītīm / ád íd aryó didhiśúvo víbhrtrāḥ / átrṣyantīr apáso yanti áchā / devāñ jánma práyasā vardháyantīḥ //*

<i>máthīd</i>	<i>yád</i>	<i>īm</i>	<i>víbhrto</i>
steal:AOR.INJ.3SG	when	ACC.SG.M	LP.carry:PPP.NOM.SG.M

mātariśvā /
Mātariśvan:NOM.SG.M

grhé-grhe · śyetó jéniyo bhūt / ád īm rájñe ná sáhyase° sácā sánn / á dūtíyam bhṛgavāṇo vivāya

‘1. The desirous females belonging to the same nest [=fingers] stimulate the desirous male [=Agni] close by—as wives of the same nest [=household] stimulate their own husband. The sisters [=fingers] have delighted in the dusky one and in the ruddy one [=two fire-kindling sticks], like cows in the brilliantly dawning dawn.

2. Even the firm fastnesses did our fathers, the *Āṅgirasas*, break with their hymns, and the rock with their shout. They made the way of lofty heaven for us; they found the day and the sun, the beacon of the ruddy dawn.

3. They set the truth in place and they set the vision of it in motion; just after that the voracious (visions) of the stranger are dispersed. Never thirsting, (the [*Āṅgirasas*’/poets’] visions), performing their tasks, go to the gods, strengthening their race with a pleasing offering.

4. When *Mātariśvan*, borne away, stole **him**, and he of worthy birth came to be gleaming in every house, after that (the fire) of the *Bhṛgus* undertook the role of messenger, as if for a more powerful king, being associated with him.’ RV 1.71.1–4

Agni is referred to by *īm* in pāda 4a but the only previous mention of him is in pāda 1a, where he is referred to by the participle *uśántam* ‘desirous’. In between, several other entities are mentioned so that one would not expect Agni to be referred to by the enclitic pronoun *īm*. However, this example is taken from a hymn which is dedicated to Agni, so that he should receive more attention and be more easily accessible than other referents that are mentioned in the hymn.

A further possible clue to the distribution of *īm*, *ī* and *sīm* may be provided by the study by Fuchs & Schumacher (2020). They assign the German demonstrative *dieser* a forward-looking function. They find that it tends to refer to an entity with a lower degree of prominence and to indicate a momentary orientation in the discourse towards this referent. Even though their referents are in most cases active, *īm*, *ī* or *sīm* may have such a forward-looking function. In both cases of pronominal *ī*, the referent is mentioned later in the hymn. Among the 11 clear examples of *sīm* there are 3 in which the referent does not occur later in the hymn.⁵⁸⁰ The ratio for *īm* is quite different. Among the 50 examples in which the referent is clearly identifiable there are only 4 in which its referent is not mentioned later in the hymn.⁵⁸¹ Yet, due to the nature of the Rigvedic data it is again difficult to determine whether this really indicates a forward-looking function of *īm*. Fuchs & Schumacher (2020) measure the number of occurrences of the referents in the text, but because of the common null-anaphora such a method is not reliable. Moreover, as has already been mentioned, the Rigvedic hymns generally do not contain comprehensive descriptions of one single event or a sequence of events.

Another factor that might determine the choice of *sīm* and *īm* is the order of referents. For as I have mentioned in Section 6.1.1, Kupfer (2002: 256f.) contends that *sīm* refers to the last referent in the anaphorical chain. As another important factor for determining the reference of a pronoun besides the prominence-lending features I have already discussed, von Heusinger & Schumacher (2019: 119) also list the order in which reference have been mentioned. Thus, Zifonun et al. (1997: 559) observe that German *dieser* tends to refer to the referent that has been mentioned last and Kaiser & Trueswell (2008) recognize the influence of word order regarding the use of the Finnish demonstrative *tämä* ‘this’. However, at least for *dieser*, Patil et al. (2020) and Fuchs & Schumacher (2020) most recently argued against such an analysis. Nevertheless,

⁵⁸⁰ In RV 1.37.6, *sīm* refers to *divás ca gmás* ‘of heaven and earth’, but in stanza 8 *prthivī* ‘earth’ is mentioned. I do not regard this as one of the passages where the referent does not occur later. I do, however, include RV 1.122.6 (ex. (602)), where *sīm* refers to *me ... hávā imá* ‘these calls of mine’ and where the following clause begins with *śrótu nas* ‘let her hear us’. Here one may argue that the second clause is elliptical ‘let her hear our (thoughts)’ or that ‘us’ metonymically refers to ‘our calls’.

⁵⁸¹ With respect to this criterion, I have given only the cases in which I am fairly certain that the referent is not mentioned later in the hymn. Due to the nature of the Rigvedic hymns, this is not always easy to determine.

Vedic with its non-configurational syntax might behave differently from German. Among the 11 cases in which *sīm* has a clear referent, it is cataphoric once, so that I regard this case as exceptional. Among the 10 remaining cases, it refers 5 times to the last-mentioned referent and 5 times it does not. Notice that this referent need not be the last-mentioned nominal. In ex. (612) above, *sīm* is coreferential with the pronoun *tásya*. This pronoun is followed by the nominal expression *svátavān pāyús* ‘a self-powerful protector’. This is, however, not a referring expression but the predicate noun. The last nominal of the clause in pāda c is a vocative, which I also do not count because vocatives are not part of the predicate’s argument structure and regularly occur outside the actual clause. Similarly, a vocative and the nominal predicate occur between *sīm* and its referent in ex. (603) above. However, there the referent functions as a genitive attribute of the predicate noun. Yet, even though I do not count morphological vocatives, there is one case in which *sīm* refers to the argument of a vocative:

(627) <i>kó</i>	<i>vo</i>	<i>várṣiṣṭha</i>	<i>á</i>	<i>naro</i>	/
who:NOM.SG.M	2PL.GEN	highest:NOM.SG.M	LP	man:VOC.PL.M	
<i>divás</i>	<i>ca</i>	<i>gmás</i>	<i>ca</i>	<i>dhūtayaḥ</i>	/ yát
heaven:GEN.SG.M	and	earh:GEN.SG.F	and	shaker:VOC.PL.M	when
<i>sīm</i>	<i>ántaṃ</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>dhūnuthá</i>		
ACC.DU.M	end:ACC.SG.M	like	shake:2PL		

‘Which of you is the highest, o superior men—you shakers of heaven and earth, since you shake **them** like the end (of a garment)?’ RV 1.37.6

Even though the referent occurs in a vocative expression, I subsume this case, like exx. (612) and (603) in the group of cases where *sīm* refers to the last-mentioned referent.

A further factor that needs to be considered is that in 2 cases, the referent of *sīm* is a null element, so that it cannot be mentioned last. One of these cases is the following, involving a change of person, which is not uncommon in the Rigveda:

(628) <i>úṣo</i>	<i>arvácā</i>	<i>bṛhatā</i>	<i>ráthena</i>	/
Dawn:VOC.SG.F	towards.here:INS.SG.M	lofty:INS.SG.M	chariot:INS.SG.M	
<i>jyótiṣmatā</i>	<i>vāmám</i>	<i>asmábhya</i> ^o	<i>vakṣi</i>	//
with.light:INS.SG.M	valuable:ACC.SG.N	1PL.DAT	pull:AOR.IMP.2SG	
<i>práti</i>	<i>sīm</i>	<i>agnír</i>	<i>jarate</i>	
LP	ACC.SG.F	fire:NOM.SG.M	awake:MID.3SG	
<i>sámiddhaḥ</i>				
LP.kindle:PPP:NOM.SG.M				

‘Dawn, with your lofty, light-filled chariot turned hither, convey to us a thing of value. 2. In response **to her** the kindled fire awakens’ RV 7.78.1c–2a

Here, Dawn is the addressee of the imperative of the first clause and therefore not mentioned explicitly in this clause but only by the initial, extra-clausal, vocative. The second case is ex.

(618) above. There, the participle *hinvānás* ‘being impelled’ might actually be used to denote Soma but I follow Jamison & Brereton (2014: 454) in assuming that it is probably used predicatively there. One can sum up the results for *sīm* by saying that of 10 clear attestations of anaphoric *sīm*, it refers 7 times to the last-mentioned referent or to a null referent.

Among the 70 instances where *īm* clearly has pronominal function, in 50 the referent can be identified unambiguously. In two cases (RV 5.9.5 and 8.47.1), *īm* functions as a correlative pronoun. I exclude these cases because there it refers to an entire clause, in which other referents may be mentioned, and not to a single expression within a clause. I also exclude one case (RV 7.40.3) in which a relative clause that restrictively modifies the demonstrative with which *īm* is coreferential occurs between the demonstrative and *īm*. In 33 of the remaining text passages, *īm* does not refer to the last-mentioned referent, while there are 14 passages in which it does refer to the last-mentioned referent. The two groups are exemplified by the following passages:

(629) *apsú* *drapsó* *vāvṛdhe*
 water:LOC.PL.F drop:NOM.SG.M grow.strong:PERF.3SG
śyenájūto / *duhá* **īm** *pitā*
 sped.by.falcon:NOM.SG.M milk:MID.3SG ACC.SG.M father:NOM.SG.M
 ‘The drop, sped by the falcon, has grown strong in the waters. His father yields **him** as milk’ RV 9.89.2cd

(630) *sómam* *manīṣā* *abhy* *ànūṣata*
 Soma:ACC.SG.M thought:NOM.PL.F LP roar:AOR.MID.3SG
stúbho / *abhí* *dhenávaḥ* *páyasem [= páyasā īm]*
 rhythm:NOM.PL.F LP giving.milk:NOM.PL.F milk:INS.SG.N+ACC.SG.M
aśīśrayuḥ
 mix:AOR.3PL

‘The inspired thoughts, the rhythms have roared to Soma; the milk-cows have mixed **him** with milk.’ RV 9.86.17cd

I have applied here the same criteria as for *sīm* above. One passage, which I have included in the group in which *īm* refers to the last-mentioned referent is noteworthy. There, *īm* refers to the second member of a compound which is used as an epithet (cf. Jamison comm.VIII.1: ad loc.):

(631) *yáḥ* *saṃsthé* *cic* *chatákratur* /
 REL:NOM.SG.M conflict:LOC.SG.M PRT with.hundred.intentions:NOM.SG.M
ād **īm** *kṛṇóti* *vṛtrahā*
 then ACC.PL.M do:3SG Vṛtra.smasher:NOM.SG.M

‘Who as “hundred-intentioned one” then carries **them** out in the concourse as Vṛtra-smasher’ RV 8.32.11ab

Jamison (comm.VIII.1: ad loc.) calls ex. (631) “[a] novel construction” and explains that “[t]he word *-kratu-* ‘intention, resolve’ is extracted from Indra’s epithet *śatá-kratu-* and implicitly

made object of *kṛnóti*, represented by the enclitic pronoun *īm*”. Another special case is the following example:

(632) *néndro* [= *ná índra*] *astīti* *néma* *u* *tva*
 NEG+Indra:NOM.SG.M be:3SG+QUOT several:NOM.SG.M PRT one:NOM.SG.M
āha / *ká* *īm* *dadarśa* *kám*
 say:PERF.3SG who:NOM.SG.M ACC.SG.M see:PERF.3SG who:ACC.SG.M
abhí *ṣṭavāma*
 LP praise:SBJV.1PL

‘‘Indra does not exist,’ so says many a one. ‘Who has seen **him**? Whom shall we praise?’’
 RV 8.100.3ab

Here, Indra, whose existence is negated, is the referent of *īm*, but here the direct speech is interrupted, so that the indefinite *nemas* occurs between them. I do not regard Indra as the last-mentioned referent.

When one compares the respective numbers of the five different groups I have just discussed, one can see that the distribution of *īm* is clearly different from that of *sīm*. The ratio changes to some degree if one considers that in 5 cases in which *īm* does not refer to the last-mentioned referent, it refers to a null referent.⁵⁸² This means that in 19 cases it refers to the last-mentioned or a null referent and in 28 cases it does not refer to the last mentioned or a null referent. This ratio of 28:19 is a stark contrast to *sīm*, for which the ratio is 3:7. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that word order is the sole factor which determines the distribution of *īm* and *sīm* because there is still a relatively large number of cases in which *īm* refers to the last-mentioned nominal in the previous clause. As for *ī*, in ex. (604) a non-restrictive relative clause that modifies the referent occur between the referent and *ī*. In (605), *ī* does not refer to the last-mentioned nominal.

It is possible that the choice of *īm* or *sīm* might interact with word order of the preceding clause. For Vedic, this seems all the more plausible because according to Viti (2009, 2010), the word order indicates the degree of relative prominence of the actants with respect to each other. She finds that when the object precedes the subject, the former is usually more prominent. Likewise, when the subject precedes the object, it is the subject which is more prominent.⁵⁸³ However, she defines prominence more loosely than von Heusinger & Schumacher (2019) and includes animacy, number and specificity/genericity in her analysis. Nevertheless, her findings suggest that the prominence-lending feature of grammatical role may interact with word order.

⁵⁸² These passages are RV 1.67.4, 1.148.5, 2.30.3, 8.50.2, 9.110.6. Two additional passages may be RV 1.65.6 and 9.92.2, where the clause boundaries are unclear.

⁵⁸³ On the position of the verb see also Klein (1991, 1994) and Viti (2008b). Remember that the basic word order of Vedic is considered to be SOV but that in the poetic language of the Rigveda deviations from this pattern are regular.

Yet, with respect to the choice of \bar{im} or $s\bar{im}$ this criterion is difficult to apply. In order to evaluate the influence of word order in the previous clause, both subject and object have to be realized as full nominal expressions in this clause. Viti also includes pronominal arguments in her analysis, but in my opinion including only nominal arguments yields a better comparability. Enclitic pronouns tend to occur in the second position, and accented pronouns tend to occur in the first position of the clause. This means that they exhibit different syntactic behavior and cannot be compared with each other, or with other nominals.

For $s\bar{im}$, I find no clear case where it picks up the subject or object of a previous clause and both are encoded by a full nominal expression. One such case might be ex. (624) but there it seems that pādas a and b each constitute a separate clause where the subject or the verb, respectively, is omitted. Likewise, the two passages containing pronominal \bar{i} are not eligible for investigating this criterion. For \bar{im} , I find 5 eligible passages where it refers to the previous object and 3 eligible passages where it refers to the subject of the previous clause. However, as the data are insufficient for a comparison of the three forms, I will not discuss this potential criterion any further.

Thus far, I have only investigated isolated factors that might influence the choice of the pronominals. However, studies like Schumacher et al. (2016), Schumacher et al. (2017) or Kizilkaya (2021) show that several factors interact with respect to the employment or interpretation of a pronoun. Yet, other prominence-lending features do not appear to provide any more clear clues either. For instance, among the cases in which \bar{im} refers to the last nominal, I count 3 in which this nominal is the subject and 6 in which it is the object.

Before ending the discussion of the pronominal forms \bar{im} , \bar{i} and $s\bar{im}$, one peculiarity with respect to their distribution is noteworthy. In Section 6.1.1, I mentioned that Jamison (2002: 294–298) observes a different distribution of \bar{im} and $s\bar{im}$ with respect to the gender of their referent. The potential role of gender as a prominence feature is investigated by Esaulova & von Stockhausen (2015). Jamison finds that both \bar{im} and $s\bar{im}$ most often refer to a masculine singular but that for \bar{im} it is in the vast majority that it refers to a masculine singular referent whereas the distribution of $s\bar{im}$ is relatively even. For \bar{im} , she finds that it has about 125 masculine singular referents and only 44 of all other numbers and genders. According to my stricter criteria for pronominal \bar{im} , the ratio is even clearer. Of the 50 cases of pronominal \bar{im} that I find with a clear referent, it refers 41 times to a masculine singular. In 5 further cases it is another masculine form, 3 times it is feminine and only in ex. (613) is it a neuter. This means that in 46 cases \bar{im} is masculine and in only 4 cases it is not. In contrast, of the 11 cases of $s\bar{im}$ with a clear referent, only 3 times is it masculine singular. In general, it is 6 times masculine, 4

times feminine and once neuter. In the two cases where *ī* is used as a pronoun, it refers to soma, which means that it is masculine. With respect to *īm*, it is interesting that in the clauses where its referent is feminine, it occurs with a predicate that usually takes feminine objects:

(633) <i>yáśyānakṣā́</i> REL:GEN.SG.M+blind:NOM.SG.F	<i>duhitá</i> daughter:NOM.SG.F	<i>jātu</i> from.birth	<i>áśa</i> be:PERF.3SG	/
<i>kás</i> who:NOM.SG.M	<i>tām</i> DEM:ACC.SG.F	<i>vidvām̃</i> know:PTCP.PERF.ACT.NOM.SG.M	<i>abhí</i> LP	
<i>manyāte</i> think:SBJV.MID.3SG	<i>andhām</i> blind:ACC.SG.F	/	<i>kataró</i> who:NOM.SG.M	<i>mením</i> missile:ACC.SG.F
<i>práti</i> LP	<i>tám</i> DEM:ACC.SG.M	<i>mucāte</i> unleash:AOR.SBJV.3SG	/	<i>yá</i> REL:NOM.SG.M
<i>īm̃</i> ACC.SG.F	<i>váhāte</i> marry:SBJV.MID.3SG	<i>yá</i> REL:NOM.SG.M	<i>īm̃</i> ACC.SG.F	<i>vā</i> or
<i>vareyāt</i> woo:SBJV.3SG				

‘(A father) who has a daughter blind from birth—who, knowing her (as) blind, will have designs on her [/will be hostile (to him=the father)]? (On the other hand, not knowing her state), which of the two will unleash (the power of) violated exchange against him [=the father]—the one who marries **her** or the one who woos **her** (on the bridegroom’s behalf)?’ RV 10.27.11

(634) <i>sá</i> DEM:NOM.SG.M	<i>īm̃</i> ACC.SG.M	<i>vṛṣājanayat</i> bull:NOM.SG.M+beget:CAUS.IPRF.3SG		
<i>tāsu</i> DEM:LOC.PL.F	<i>gárbham̃</i> embryo:ACC.SG.M	/	<i>sá</i> DEM:NOM.SG.M	<i>īm̃</i> ACC.PL.F
<i>śísur</i> child:NOM.SG.M	<i>dhayati</i> suck:3SG	<i>tám</i> DEM:ACC.SG.M	<i>rihanti</i> lick:3PL	

‘As bull he beget the embryo in these (waters). As infant he sucks **them**; they lick him.’ RV 2.35.13ab

When the verb *vah-* ‘pull’ is used in the middle voice, it can have the meaning, ‘lead (a woman) home’ in the sense of ‘marry (a woman)’ (Grassmann 1873: 1239). In the given context, it is clear that it has this meaning (cf. Jamison comm.X.1: ad loc.). Similarly, the verb *varey-* ‘woo’ is used with male subjects and female objects. As for the second example, the verb *dhā-* ‘suck’ can be used for children sucking on the breast of their mother, although it is also attested in other contexts (Grassmann 1873: 675). Nevertheless, the context makes it clear again that it is this use which is present here. In contrast, in ex. (613), which exhibits the only clear instance of neuter *īm*, it is not used with a verb that typically takes inanimate objects, as one might expect.

In this section, I have investigated several prominence-lending cues which are potentially influential on the choice of the pronouns *īm*, *ī* or *sīm*. However, none of these cues appear to be

able to account for the distribution of the three forms. The most significant factor appears to be the linear order of referents, where \bar{im} exhibits a preference for those that are not mentioned last. However, this tendency is not strong enough to be considered the only crucial factor at play. There are three main factors which complicate an analysis of the three forms: Firstly, the different frequency with which they occur. Since \bar{i} is attested only twice with a clear pronominal function, it is nearly impossible to identify the precise contexts in which it occurs. Likewise, apparent distributional differences between \bar{im} and $s\bar{im}$ may also be caused by the lower frequency with which the latter occurs. Thus, I have found differences with respect to thematic roles: Whereas \bar{im} is attested referring to previous patients, $s\bar{im}$ is not. However, due to the low number of attestations these findings might simply be a coincidence rather than significant. Secondly, the phonological shapes of \bar{i} , \bar{im} and $s\bar{im}$ are remarkably similar to each other. All three are monosyllabic enclitics containing an \bar{i} . This suggests that the functional difference between these forms is more subtle than e.g. between an unaccented personal pronoun and an accented demonstrative. Thirdly, the nature of the Rigvedic data makes it difficult to apply criteria that are used to analyze texts or conversations because the choice of forms in poetic texts might also be determined by other factors like the meter or stylistic devices. Moreover, I have for instance not been able to provide the ratios of the relevant forms referring to topics vs. non-topics or animate vs. inanimate beings. What is striking, however, is that the vast majority of the referents of \bar{im} are masculine whereas the distribution of $s\bar{im}$ is more even. This can be observed when one considers all potential instances of pronominal \bar{im} , as Jamison (2002) does, but also when one considers only the clearest cases of pronominal \bar{im} , as I have done.

6.2 \bar{im} , \bar{i} and $s\bar{im}$ as particles

In the previous section, I examined those cases in which \bar{im} , \bar{i} and $s\bar{im}$ are most likely to be interpreted as pronominals according to the criteria that I have presented at the beginning of Section 6. This section is now concerned with the other group of clear cases, i.e. when the forms under investigation cannot be pronominals because the context does not allow for the presence of an accusative (cf. Jamison 2002: 294).

Among the 52 attestations of $s\bar{im}$ in the Rigveda, there is in fact no case in which a pronominal function can be excluded certainly (cf. Jamison 2002: 295). The text passage in which it is most likely to not have pronominal function is the following:

(635) <i>sthiráṃ</i>	<i>hí</i>	<i>jānam</i>	<i>eṣāṃ</i>	/	<i>váyo</i>
firm:NOM.SG.N	for	birth:NOM.SG.N	DEM:GEN.PL.M		energy:NOM.SG.N

<i>mātúr</i>	<i>níretave</i>	/	<i>yát</i>	<i>sīm</i>	<i>ánu</i>
mother:ABL.SG.F	LP.go:INF.DAT.SG		REL:NOM.SG.N	ACC.PL.M	LP
<i>dvitā́</i>	<i>śávaḥ</i>				
doubly	power:NOM.SG.N				

‘Because their birth was secure, (they had) the energy to come out from their mother, the power that now as before follows **them**.’ RV 1.37.9

The subclause in pāda c does not contain a finite verb, which suggests that *sīm* does not have the function of an accusative here. Hence, Oldenberg (1909–1912: I, 40) renders the sequence *yát sīm ánu* as ‘dem entsprechend, daß’. Griffith (1896–1897: I, 53) translates this pāda as a main clause: ‘Yea, even twice enough, is theirs’. Nevertheless, a different interpretation of *sīm* is possible. In contrast to Oldenberg, Geldner (1901: 6) does not see a close relationship of *ánu* with *yát* or *sīm* but contends that a finite verb form has to be supplied for *ánu*. As the translation given in ex. (635) shows, Jamison & Brereton (2014: 145) do supply a finite verb and interpret the local particle *ánu* to be construed with it, so that they assume a predicate ‘follow’, whose object is *sīm* (cf. Jamison comm.I.1: ad loc.). Renou (1955–1969: X, 13) also supplies such a verb, but does not translate *sīm* as its object.⁵⁸⁴ All in all, this is a rather problematic stanza (cf. Müller 1891: 76; Jamison comm.I.1: ad loc.) and I am, like Kupfer (2002: 255), uncertain with respect to the status of *sīm* in this passage, even though I do not agree with her and Oldenberg that *yát sīm ánu* is a fixed collocation.

In another passage, the interpretation of *sīm* largely depends on the interpretation of the verb form which constitutes the predicate of the clause:

(636) <i>mādhvā</i>	<i>mādhuvī</i>		<i>mādhu</i>	<i>vām</i>
honey:INS.SG.N	with.honey:VOC.DU.M		honey:ACC.SG.N	2DU.DAT
<i>pruṣāyan</i>	/	<i>yát</i>	<i>sīm</i>	<i>vām</i>
splash:INJ.3PL		when	ACC.PL.F	2DU.DAT
				<i>pīkṣo</i>
				food:ACC.PL.F
<i>bhurájanta</i>	<i>pakvāḥ</i>			
boil:INJ.MID.3PL	cooked:ACC.PL.F			

‘(its wheel-rims) splash honey upon honey on you, you two honeyed ones, when cooked nourishments are roasted [?] for you two.’ RV 4.43.5cd

The verb *bhurájanta* is morphologically a middle form, which means that it can, but need not, be assigned a passive meaning. Jamison & Brereton (2014: 627) opt for a passive interpretation, which means that *sīm* cannot be interpreted as the object of that verb and therefore must be a particle. Grassmann (1876–1877: I, 151) interprets the middle form as an anticausative, which

⁵⁸⁴ Oui, solide est leur engendrement, la force-vitale (qui les pousse) à sortir (du sein) de la mère./ puisque (leur) vigueur, d’emblée, (fait) suite à cette (naissance)’. Ludwig (1876–1888: II, 283) supplies a different verb, but assumes it to have an object. He translates pāda c as ‘da schon von alters her ihre kraft disz wollte’.

yields the translation ‘when your fully cooked broths were boiling’ of *pāda d*.⁵⁸⁵ This translation necessitates *sīm* to be a particle too. In contrast, Geldner (1951–1957: I, 476) chooses an interpretation of *pāda d* according to which *bhurájanta* takes an object: ‘when they give to you the cooked refreshments’.⁵⁸⁶ This interpretation requires that *pr̥kṣas* ‘cooked’ and *pakvās* ‘refreshments’ be interpreted as accusatives rather than nominatives, which is unproblematic because the forms are homonymous. If this is the correct analysis *sīm* is possibly coreferential with the aforementioned nominals and therefore the ACC.PL.F of a pronoun.⁵⁸⁷ It is difficult to decide which of the interpretations is correct, especially because the exact meaning and etymology of the verb *bhuraj-* is unclear (see Oldenberg 1909–1912: I, 303, Renou 1955–1969: XVI, 35, Mayrhofer 1992–2001: II, 266, Witzel et al. 2013: 516, Jamison comm.IV: ad loc.). As a result, this passage cannot count as a clear instance of *sīm* as a particle, either. Since there is no clear case in which *sīm* can be identified as a particle, I conclude that it does not have this function. This assumption is in accordance with Hale (1987: 76–79).

Of the 11 attestations of *ī* in the Rigveda, I find one in which it cannot be an accusative, namely the following passage:⁵⁸⁸

(637) <i>abhí</i>	<i>dvijánmā</i>	<i>trivṛ́d</i>	<i>ánnam</i>
LP	with.two.births:NOM.SG.M	threefold:ACC.SG.N	food:ACC.SG.N
<i>ṛjyate</i>	/	<i>saṃvatsaré</i>	<i>vāṽṛdhe</i>
stretch:MID.3SG		year:LOC.SG.M	grow:PERF.MID.3SG
<i>jagdhám</i>	<i>ī</i>	<i>púnah</i>	
eat:PPP.NOM.SG.N	PRT	again	

‘Having two births, he stretches toward the threefold food. In a year what was eaten (by him) has grown again.’ RV 1.140.2ab

As I have already discussed in Section 6.1.1, RIVELEX (II, 245) regards *ī* as an instrumental and Kupfer (2002: 143) seems to regard it as the nominative of a pronoun but I do not follow these views. Instead, I interpret *ī* as a particle here, which leads to the question of its function. First of all, Jamison (2002: 305) remarks that *ī* “is in a peculiar position and hence suspect” because she (comm.X.2: ad loc.) would expect it to occur in Wackernagel position. Regarding its function, she surmises that “it may mark *jagdhám* as a notional relative clause” but does not appear to be entirely certain about this. Grassmann (1873: 232f.) interprets *ī* as ‘generalizing’

⁵⁸⁵ ‘als eure garen Brühen kochend wallten’.

⁵⁸⁶ ‘wenn sie euch die gekochten Stärkungen darreichen’.

⁵⁸⁷ I find the translation of *pāda d* by Witzel et al. (2013: 190) a little awkward: ‘wenn sie ihn [Gharma] als eure Stärkungen gekocht darreichen’. If the referent of *sīm* is a masculine singular nominal, I would not expect the secondary predicate to be a (feminine) plural.

⁵⁸⁸ Jamison (2002: 305) groups this passage together with ex. (587) in Section 6.1.1, but following Kulikov (2005: 86, 2012: 727f.) an accusative interpretation is possible in ex. (587).

or indefinite in this passage, but I am skeptical with respect to this.⁵⁸⁹ What is conspicuous here is that the clause of pāda a mentions food and in pāda b, *ī* occurs after the word *jagdhām* ‘eaten’. Perhaps the particle is used to indicate a relationship between the two clauses, or specifically with its host and the previous clause. This might be in accordance with the original meaning ‘so, in this way’, which Osthoff (1881: 230) and Dunkel (2014: 377) assign to the particle. One might translate ‘In a year what was eaten (by him) in this way (i.e. by having stretched toward the food) has grown again’. However, it is not clear what *trivṛt ānnam* ‘the threefold food’ in pāda a refers to (Oldenberg 1897: 143; Jamison comm.I.2: ad loc.) so that my interpretation is uncertain as well. Thus, since this is the only passage in which *ī* according to my approach clearly functions as a particle, its function remains uncertain.⁵⁹⁰

Among the three forms under investigation, *īm* is the one that has the highest number of attestations, namely 208. Accordingly, it has the highest number of attestations of a clear non-pronominal use, namely 14. Yet, compared to the total number of attestations this is still relatively low. The contexts in which non-pronominal *īm* occurs are fairly heterogenous. Syntactically, it occurs 11 times in Wackernagel position and 3 times (RV 2.16.2; 7.20.3; 7.21.1) it does not. Regarding the word it follows, the contexts are also diverse: In 3 cases it follows a connective, twice *utá* ‘and’ (RV 1.186.6, 8) and once *ád* ‘then’ (RV 1.144.3). In two further cases it follows a relative pronoun (RV 7.32.17; 7.56.21). Once it follows the negation (RV 8.74.15), once an interrogative pronoun (RV 7.56.1), twice a demonstrative (RV 1.145.5; 9.88.2), once a predicative nominal (RV 1.129.8) and once a finite verb (RV 1.167.8). These are the cases in which *īm* occupies the second position of the clause. In those cases in which it occurs later, it appears twice after the nominal *janúṣā* ‘at (his) birth’ (RV 7.20.3; 7.21.1) and once after the negative indefinite pronoun *kím caná* ‘nothing’ (RV 2.16.2). Regarding the age of the attestations, one can observe that they reach from the old “Family Books” to young portions like the first book. A hint towards the employment of non-pronominal *īm* may be found in the following passage:

(638) <i>yúyūsataḥ</i>		<i>sávayasā</i>		<i>tád</i>		<i>íd</i>
hold:DES.3DU		of.same.vigor:NOM.DU.M		DEM:ACC.SG.N		PRT
<i>vápuḥ</i>	/	<i>samānám</i>		<i>árthaṃ</i>		
form:ACC.SG.N		same:ACC.SG.N		goal:ACC.SG.N		

⁵⁸⁹ He translates ‘was irgend verzehrt ist (vom Feuer), das alles wächst im Jahre wieder’.

⁵⁹⁰ An interesting text passage with respect to the use of *ī* here is Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa 15.5.23: *hīti vā annaṃ pradīyata īty [= ī iti] āgrir annam atti* ‘With (the word) ‘yes’ (*hi*), food is given; by (the word) *ī* Agni eats the food’ (text from TITUS, translation from Caland 1931: 406). In a comment, Caland (1931: 406) surmises that “*ī* is used to express the hissing sound of butter poured into the fire”. If this is correct, maybe *ī* is used to imitate some sound related to fire in ex. (637) too.

<i>vitáritratā</i> LP.cross:INT.PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.DU.M		<i>mitháḥ</i> / <i>ād</i> <i>īm</i> <i>bhágo</i> <i>ná</i> mutually then PRT Bhaga:NOM.SG.M like	
<i>háviyah</i> call:GDV.NOM.SG.M	[... / ...] //	<i>yám</i> REL:ACC.SG.M	<i>īm</i> PRT
<i>duvā́</i> two:NOM.DU.M	<i>sávayasā</i> of.same.vigor:NOM.DU.M		<i>saparyátaḥ</i> / [.../.../...] // serve:3DU
<i>tám</i> DEM:ACC.SG.M	<i>īm</i> ACC.SG.M	<i>hinvanti</i> urge:3PL	<i>dhítáyo</i> <i>dáśa</i> thought:NOM.PL.F ten:NOM
<i>vriśo</i> finger:NOM.PL.F			

‘The two of the same vigor [=fire-churning sticks] seek to keep hold of that marvelous form, constantly crossing each other in turn, toward the same goal; after that he is to be invoked like Bhaga. [...].

4. **He** whom the two of the same vigor serve [...].

5. Our insights and our ten fingers urge **him** on.’ RV 1.144.3–5a

The first instance of *īm* constitutes a clear case of a particle use (cf. Hopkins 1907: 381) whereas the other two are ambiguous according to my criteria. Jamison (comm.I.2: ad loc.) observes that the collocation *ād īm* is reminiscent of *ād íd*, which I discussed extensively in Section 5.3. She assumes that *īm* “may have been substituted for **íd* because of the 2nd position *īm* opening the next two verses (4a *yád īm*, 5a *tám īm*)”.⁵⁹¹ Even though she does not consider *īm* to be a substitute for *íd*, Kupfer (2002: 139) assumes a similar function for *īm* in another passage in which it follows *ād*.⁵⁹² Indeed, there are further passages in which *īm* occurs in the same contexts in which *íd* occurs, as in the following passage:

(639) [...] /	<i>sácā</i> LP	<i>yád</i> when	<i>īm</i> ACC.PL.F	<i>vṛśamaṇā</i> with.mind.on.bulls:NOM.SG.F
<i>ahaṃyú</i> proud:NOM.SG.F	/	<i>sthirá</i> firm:NOM.SG.F	<i>cij</i> PRT	<i>jánīr</i> <i>váhate</i> wife:ACC.PL.F pull:MID.3SG
<i>subhāgāḥ</i> well.portioned:ACC.PL.F	//	<i>pānti</i> protect:3PL	<i>mitrávaruṇāv</i> Mitra.Varuṇa:NOM.DU.M	
<i>avadyāc</i> unspeakable:ABL.SG.N	/	<i>cáyata</i> punish:MID.3SG	<i>īm</i> ACC.PL.M	<i>aryamó</i> Aryaman:NOM.SG.M+PRT
<i>ápraśastān</i> unlaudable:ACC.PL.M	/	<i>utá</i> <i>cyavante</i> and stir:MID.3PL	<i>ácyutā</i> unistirrable:NOM.PL.N	
<i>dhruvāṇi</i> firm:NOM.PL.N	<i>vāvṛdhá</i> grow.strong:PERF.MID.3SG		<i>īm</i> PRT	<i>maruto</i> Marut:VOC.PL.M
<i>dātivārah</i> giving.wish:NOM.SG.M				

⁵⁹¹ Notice, however, that pāda 3a contains *íd*.

⁵⁹² “Der Fokus in diesem Beleg schränkt die Auswahl auf genau eine Möglichkeit ein, nämlich den Zeitpunkt auf den sich die Erzählung bezieht”. She refers to RV 1.71.4c, which I regard as ambiguous.

‘[...] when in company with them, her mind set on the bulls, she, self-reliant and firm, brings with her the well-portioned Wives (of the Gods).

8. Mitra and Varuṇa (and Aryaman) protect from the unspeakable (fault); Aryaman makes the unlaudable (men) atone. And the unstirring fixed things stir, (when) your wish-granting (flock) has grown strong, o Maruts.’ RV 1.167.7c–8

The first two instances of *īm* are again ambiguous according to my criteria. According to Witzel & Gotō (2007: 753), the two instances of *īm* in stanza 8, i.e. one ambiguous case and one clear particle,⁵⁹³ express a contrast with the preceding clause. Also Kupfer (2002: 139) assumes that *īm* in pāda 8d marks a contrast between the verb it follows and the verb in the preceding clause. In a similar vein, Lühr (1997: 70) regards pādas 8cd as a concessive conditional construction. Notice that in 8b and 8c *īm* occurs after a finite verb, where one function of *íd* is to emphasize a certain relationship, e.g. contrast, between two clauses. In both cases, it is possible to interpret *īm* as an emphasizer. As in ex. (639), there is a further passage where *īm* functions as a particle and another instance of *īm* occurs nearby, this time in the preceding stanza. In this passage, the particle *īm* occurs after a predicate noun:

(640) <i>svayám śá</i>	<i>riṣayádhyai</i>	/	<i>yá</i>	<i>na</i>
herself DEM:NOM.SG.F	harm:CAUS.INF.DAT.SG		REL:NOM.SG.F	1PL.ACC
<i>upeśé</i>	<i>atraíḥ</i>	/	<i>hatém [= hatá īm]</i>	
LP.seek:PERF.MID.3SG	devourer:INS.PL.M		smash:PPP.NOM.SG.F+PRT	
<i>asan ná vakṣati</i>				
be:SBJV.3SG NEG grow.strong:AOR.SBJV?.3SG				

‘She herself [=Bad Thought] is to be harmed who has sought us out with her devourers. She will be smashed, she will not wax strong’ RV 1.129.8d–f

In this example, where the copula is in the subjunctive, *īm* can be interpreted as a marker of epistemic modality, expressing the speaker’s certainty of the truth of the proposition. This is again parallel to the function of *íd*. Again, an ambiguous instance of *īm*, which co-occurs with another accusative, is found in the preceding stanza, although 7 pādas occur between the two instances of *īm*:

(641) <i>durmánmānaṃ</i>	<i>sumántubhir</i>	/	<i>á</i>	<i>īm</i>
with.bad.thoughts:ACC.SG.M	easily.known:INS.PL.N		LP	ACC.SG.M
<i>iṣá</i>	<i>prcīmahi</i>			
refreshment:INS.SG.F	fill:AOR.OPT.MID:1PL			

‘When he has bad thoughts (toward us) we would engorge **him** with (words) good to think about and with refreshment’ RV 1.129.7de

⁵⁹³ According to Grassmann (1873: 1337–1342), the verb *vr̥dh-* ‘strengthen’ is not used transitively in the middle voice unless it is reflexive, so that I regard *īm* as a particle in pāda 8d. Nevertheless, in this passage he appears to assume that *īm* refers to Mitra and Varuṇa. In his translation, he (1876–1877: II, 164) translates it as an intransitive verb: ‘gestärkt ist der, der gerne gibt, o Maruts’. I consider it as intransitive.

The following example from a hymn dedicated to Agni shows *īm* in yet another context in which *íd* is found as well:

(642) <i>abhí</i>	<i>śvāntám</i>	<i>mṛśate</i>	<i>nāndíye</i>	<i>mudé</i>	/
LP	swelling:ACC.SG.M	touch:MID.3SG	joy:DAT.SG.F	delight:DAT.SG.F	
<i>yád</i>	īm	<i>gáchanti</i>	<i>uśatír</i>		
when	ACC.SG.M	go:3SG	wish:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.PL.F		
<i>apiṣṭhitám</i>		// <i>sá</i>	īm	<i>mṛgó</i>	.
LP.stand:PPP.ACC.SG.M		DEM:NOM.SG.M	PRT	beast:NOM.SG.M	
<i>ápiyo</i>		<i>vanargúr</i>	/	<i>úpa</i>	<i>tvací</i>
from.water:NOM.SG.M		roaming.in.woods:NOM.SG.M		LP	skin:LOC.SG.F
<i>upamásyām</i>	<i>ní</i>	<i>dhāyi</i>			
highest:LOC.SG.F	LP	put:AOR.INJ.PASS.3SG			

‘He touches the swelling one for joy and delight, when the willing females [=streams of ghee?] go **to him** standing right there.

5. This wild beast of the waters that roams in the woods has been installed upon the uppermost skin.’ RV 1.145.4c–5b

In Section 5.2, I showed that *íd* after pronouns may be employed for emphatic assertion of identity. In pāda 5a of ex. (642), the demonstrative *sá*, which is followed by the particle *īm*, is coreferential with the accusative *apiṣṭhitám* ‘(the one) standing there’ in the previous pāda. Hence, it is possibly also coreferential with the ambiguous *īm* in pāda 4d (i.e. under the assumption that it is used as a pronoun here). This may have caused the poet to use *īm* instead of *íd* in pāda 5a.⁵⁹⁴ Another case where *īm* possibly has a similar function after *sá* is 9.88.2.

In all the passages regarding the particle *īm* that I have shown thus far, *īm* can be assigned one of the functions of *íd* and another form of *īm* (which is ambiguous between pronoun and particle) is present in the surrounding context. The following passage constitutes a context where *íd* is found as well, namely in a question after the interrogative proform. However, the presence of *īm* probably cannot be attributed to the presence of another instance of *īm*:

(643) <i>ká</i>	īm	<i>viaktā</i>	<i>náraḥ</i>
who:NOM.SG.M	PRT	LP.anoint:PPP.NOM.PL.M	man:NOM.PL.M
<i>sániḷā</i>	/	<i>rudráya</i>	<i>máryā</i>
with.same.nest:NOM.PL.M		Rudra:GEN.SG.M	young.man:NOM.PL.M
<i>ádha</i>	<i>suáśvāḥ</i>		
then	with.good.horses:NOM.PL.M		

‘Who, separately, are these anointed superior men who belong to the same nest—the young bloods of Rudra, possessing good horses?’ RV 7.56.1

⁵⁹⁴ I would like to thank Erica Biagetti for drawing my attention to a potential influence of the previous *īm* in this case.

There does in fact occur an instance of *īm* later in the hymn but it is as many as 20 stanzas later and it is not an ambiguous attestation as in the previous examples but clearly a particle (cf. the discussion of ex. (644) below). Determining the function of *īm* is especially difficult because in Section 5.10, I have not been able to determine the exact function of *íd* after interrogatives either. Grassmann (1873: 233) gives the particle ‘doch’ as a possible translation. Lanman (1912: 131) translates ‘who pray?’. Jamison (comm.VII: ad loc.) simply remarks that *īm* cannot be an accusative here. Nevertheless, one can summarize that in 6 of the 14 instances where *īm* certainly is a particle it occurs in the same context as *íd*. In 5 of these 6 cases another instance of *īm* is present. The assumption that *īm* fulfills similar functions to *íd* is in accordance with Monier-Williams (1899: 170) and Apte (1957–1959: I, 392), who both assign it the function of affirmation and restriction. If the above passages point to a use of *īm* that is comparable to *íd* the question is then how to interpret the remaining 8 passages. Two conspicuous cases are those in which *īm* occurs after the relative pronoun. One of these cases is the following passage:

(644) <i>tuvám</i>	<i>vísvasya</i>	<i>dhanadā</i>	<i>asi</i>
2SG.NOM	all:GEN.SG.M	giving.spoils:NOM.SG.M	be:2SG
<i>śrutó</i>	/ <i>yá</i>	<i>īm</i>	<i>bhávanti</i>
hear:PPP.NOM.SG.M	REL:NOM.PL.M	PRT	become:3PL
			<i>ājáyah</i>
			battle:NOM.PL.M

‘You are famed as the giver of spoils to everyone, whatever battles there are.’⁵⁹⁵ RV 7.32.17ab

In this example, as well as in RV 7.56.21, *īm* occurs in a universal concessive conditional clause. Conspicuously, this is also a context in which *cid* occurs (Section 4.6.2.1). As a result, Lühr (1997: 68) assumes that *īm* has the same function as *cid* in this context (cf. Grassmann 1873: 232f., Geldner 1907–1909: I, 31).⁵⁹⁶ Hettrich (1988: 558–561) rejects the assumption that *īm* is employed to give relative clauses a universal or free-choice reading. He argues that firstly, the two forms can be interpreted as pronouns in most of the cases. Secondly, there are also relative clauses with universal or free-choice reading that do not receive a special marking. Thirdly, among those passages in which *īm* certainly cannot be a pronoun, there is a case in which it cannot have a generalizing function either. Accordingly, Jamison (comm.VII: ad loc.) regards *īm* in this passage as functionless. However, for *cid* I argued for an interpretation as a marker of universal concessive conditionals in spite of such objections by Hettrich. Moreover, as the third passage of a certain particle use of *īm* after a relative pronoun that he gives in addition to the two that I have given is the following:

⁵⁹⁵ The translation of pāda a is adopted from Jamison & Brereton (2014: 922); the translation of pāda b follows Geldner (1951–1957: II, 209): ‘Du bist als der Geber jeglichen Schatzes berühmt, was es auch für Kämpfe gibt’.

⁵⁹⁶ Unlike me, she also assumes this function for *sīm*.

(645) <i>yá</i>		<i>īm</i>	<i>váhanta</i>	<i>āsúbhiḥ</i>	/
REL:NOM.PL.M		ACC.SG.N	pull:INJ.MID.3PL	swift:INS.PL.M	
<i>pībanto</i>			<i>madirám</i>	<i>mádhu</i>	/
drink:PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.PL.M			exhilarating:ACC.SG.N	honey:ACC.SG.N	
<i>átra</i>	<i>śrávāṃsi</i>		<i>dadhire</i>		
here	fame:ACC.PL.N		take:PERF.MID.3PL		

‘(The Maruts), who drive themselves with their swift horses, drinking the exhilarating honey, here they have acquired their fame.’ RV 5.61.11

I agree with Hettrich (1988: 560) that this relative clause is clearly not generalizing. However, I do not regard this as a clear case of *īm* as a particle, because it might be a pronoun that is coreferential with *madirám mádhu* ‘the exhilarating honey’ (Jamison comm.V: ad loc.).

The particle *īm* occurs also in another position that resembles the use of *cid*, namely after a negation:

(646) <i>satyám</i>	<i>ít</i>	<i>tvā</i>	<i>mahenadi</i>	/	<i>páruṣṇi</i>
true:NOM.SG.N	PRT	2SG.ACC	great.river:VOC.SG.F		Paruṣṇi:VOC.SG.F
<i>áva</i>	<i>dediśam</i>	/	<i>ném [= ná īm]</i>	<i>āpo</i>	
LP	show:INT.SBJV.1SG		NEG+PRT	water:VOC.PL.F	
<i>aśvadātarah</i>		/	<i>śaviṣṭhād</i>	<i>asti</i>	
giving.horses:COMP.NOM.SG.M			most.powerful:ABL.SG.M	be:3SG	
<i>mártiyah</i>					
mortal:NOM.SG.M					

‘This is really true—what I forcefully point out to you, o great river Paruṣṇi: o waters, there exists no mortal who is a greater giver of horses than most powerful (Śrutarvan).’ RV 8.74.15

In ex. (283) of Section 4.8, *cid* occurs after the prohibitive negation and I assume that it is employed to reduce the tolerance for deviations. I consider it very plausible that *īm* has such a function here as well. For the truth of the proposition in the second hemistich is emphasized in the first hemistich in a threefold matter: Firstly, the lexeme *satyá-* ‘true’ is used. Secondly, this lexeme is followed by *íd*, which further emphasizes it.⁵⁹⁷ Thirdly, the reporting verb is an intensive verb form (cf. Jamison comm.VIII.2: ad loc.). Hence, I do not believe that the presence of *īm* is a coincidence here but I assume that by reducing the tolerance for exceptions it further contributes to the emphasis of the truth of the proposition in the second hemistich. This is in accordance with Geldner (1907–1909: I, 31), who considers the function of *īm* in this example to be equal to that of *evá*. The latter he (1907–1909: I, 42) considers to be emphatic after *ná* (‘doch (gar) nicht’). Note that *íd* also functions as a slack regulator (Section 5.4) but

⁵⁹⁷ It is difficult to determine the exact function of *íd* here. It may be exclusive (‘what I tell you is nothing but the truth’), it may indicate exhaustive focus (‘it is the truth that I tell you’), or it may be an emphaticizer (‘what I tell you is really true’).

the collocation *ná id (néd)* has the function of a conjunction ‘lest’. A further interesting case is the following, where *īm* occurs after *utá* ‘and’ in three subsequent stanzas:

(647) *úpa va eṣe námasā jigīṣā / uṣāśānāktā sudúgheva dhenúḥ / samāné áhan vimimāno arkám / víṣurūpe páyasi sásmin údhan // utá no áhir budhnyo máyas kaḥ / śísuṃ ná pipyúṣīva veti síndhuḥ / yéna nápātam apāṃ junāma / manojúvo vṛṣaṇo yám váhanti //*

<i>utá</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>īm</i>	<i>tváṣṭā</i>	<i>á</i>	<i>gantu</i>	<i>áchā</i> /
and	1PL.ACC	PRT	Tvaṣṭar:NOM.SG.M	LP	go:AOR.IMP.3SG	LP

<i>smát</i>	<i>sūribhir</i>	<i>abhipitvé</i>	<i>sajóṣāḥ</i>
together	patron:INS.PL.M	evening:LOC.SG.N	in.unison:NOM.SG.M

á vṛtrahá índaras carṣaṇiprás / tuvíṣtamo narāṃ na ihá gamyāḥ //

<i>utá</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>īm</i>	<i>matáyo</i>	<i>ásvayogāḥ</i>	/
and	1PL.GEN	ACC.SG.M	thought:NOM.PL.F	horse.yoked:NOM.PL.F	

<i>śísuṃ</i>	<i>ná</i>	<i>gāvas</i>	<i>táruṇaṃ</i>	<i>rihanti</i>	/
child:ACC.SG.M	like	cow:NOM.PL.F	tender:ACC.SG.M	lick:3PL	

<i>tám</i>	<i>īm</i>	<i>gíro</i>	<i>jánayo</i>
DEM:ACC.SG.M	ACC.SG.M	song:NOM.PL.F	wife:NOM.PL.F

<i>ná</i>	<i>pátnīḥ</i>	/	<i>surabhíṣtamaṃ</i>	<i>narāṃ</i>
like	mistress:NOM.PL.F		sweet.smelling:SUP.ACC.SG.M	man:GEN.PL.M

nasanta //
approach:INJ.MID.3PL

<i>utá</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>īm</i>	<i>marúto</i>	<i>vṛddhásenāḥ</i>	/
and	1PL.DAT	PRT	Marut:NOM.PL.M	with.large.weapons:NOM.PL.M	

<i>smád</i>	<i>ródasī</i>	<i>sámanasaḥ</i>	<i>sadantu</i>	/
together	Rodasī:NOM.SG.F	like.minded:NOM.PL.M	sit:AOR.IMP.3PL	

pṛśadaśvāso 'vánayo ná ráthā / riśádaso mitrayújo ná devāḥ

4. With a desire for gain I hasten for you with homage to Dawn and Night, (who are) like a cow that is easily milked, as in one and the same day I measure out my chant in milk of dissimilar forms (though found) in the same udder.

5. And let Ahi Budhnya create joy for us. As a (cow) swelling (with milk) pursues her young, the River pursues (the hymn?) with which we will speed the Child of the Waters, whom the bulls having the speed of thought convey.

‘6. And let Tvaṣṭar come right here to us, in concert with the patrons, at the evening mealtime. Indra, the Vṛtra-smasher, who fills the domains, the most powerful of men, should come here to us.

7. And our horse-yoked thoughts lick **him** like cows their tender young. Our songs approach him, the sweetest smelling of men, like wedded wives.

8. And let the like-minded Maruts along with Rodasī sit here for us—their weapons grown strong, their horses dappled, their chariots like streams—the gods who care for the stranger, like yokemates in alliance.’ RV 1.186.4–8

Stanzas 6–8 all begin with the sequence *utá nas īm*. On *īm* in pāda 7a, which I regard as ambiguous, see ex. (581). In 7c, *īm* is ambiguous as well. In 6a and 8a, *īm* is a particle. This is again a context in which the employment of *īm* resembles that of *cid*. For in exx. (94) and (95) of Section 4.2 *cid* follows *utó (utá u)*. In ex. (647), it is the enclitic pronoun *nas* ‘for us’ that

intervenes between *utá* and *īm* instead of the particle *u*. I do not consider *nas* to have an effect on the interpretation of *īm* here. It occurs in this position due to syntactic rules.⁵⁹⁸ As with *cid*, it is difficult to determine the function of *īm* in this context. Klein (1985b: 429) observes that stanza 5, which begins with *utá* too, is connected rather loosely with stanza 4. In contrast, he sees a closer connection between stanza 6 and 5. Moreover, he observes that in pāda “6c the reference changes to Indra, creating an enchaînement with 7, which is entirely devoted to Indra. This thematic concatenation is matched by the identical openings, *utá na īm*, in both 6a and 7a”. Regarding stanza 8, he finds that even though it also begins with *utá na īm* it has a different referent again, namely the Maruts. This might actually be a hint towards a different interpretations of *īm* as a particle or as a pronoun: In stanza 6 and 8, where *īm* is a particle, *utá* (*nas*) *īm* conjoins two stanzas that address different deities. In contrast, stanza 7 continues referring to the deity that is also referred to in 6cd. Here, *īm* may be a pronoun which is coreferential with just this deity, namely Indra.

In two passages, it is possible to interpret *īm* as a scalar additive particle. I will discuss the first of these here:

(648) <i>yudhmó</i> fighter:NOM.SG.M	<i>anarvā</i> unassailable:NOM.SG.M	<i>khajakṛt</i> creating.tumult:NOM.SG.M
<i>samādvā</i> fighting:NOM.SG.M	/	<i>śúraḥ</i> hero:NOM.SG.M
<i>janúṣem [= janúṣā īm]</i> at.birth+PRT	<i>áṣāḥhaḥ</i> unconquerable:NOM.SG.M	/ <i>ví</i> LP
<i>āsa</i> throw:PERF.MID3SG	<i>índraḥ</i> Indra:NOM.SG.M	<i>pṛtanāḥ</i> battle:ACC.PL.F
<i>suójā</i> very.strong:NOM.SG.M		

‘An unassailable battler, creating tumult, combat-hardened—a champion, conquering entirely, unconquerable even at his birth—Indra of great strength dispersed the battle arrays’ RV 7.20.3

Regarding this passage, Jamison (2002: 304) remarks the following: “There is no possibly accusative referent here, and it is hard to escape the conclusion that in this case *īm* serves as a punctuating, pseudo-second-position ‘particle’, marking off the clausette *janúṣā...áṣāḥhaḥ* ‘from birth unconquerable’ from its preceding contrastive adjective *satrāṣāṭ* ‘always conquering’”. In her commentary, Jamison (comm.VII: ad loc.) assumes that *īm* serves to avoid hiatus and to signal a close relationship between *janúṣā* and *áṣāḥhaḥ*.⁵⁹⁹ In spite of Jamison’s analysis in the commentary, Jamison & Brereton’s (2014: 908) translation contains the scalar

⁵⁹⁸ For references on the position of elements within the “initial string” see Section 4.10.

⁵⁹⁹ Grassmann (1873: 233) believes that *īm* has been added by later redaction in order to avoid hiatus.

additive particle ‘even’, whose focus is ‘at his birth’, i.e. the translation of the adverb (petrified instrumental) preceding *īm*. Even though Jamison does not assign a scalar additive function to *īm* their translation indicates that assuming such a function is justifiable in the given context. Moreover, in the previous examples I have shown contexts in which the use of *īm* resembles that of *cid*, especially in concessive conditional clauses. I therefore assume that *īm* has the function of a scalar additive particle in ex. (648). I assume the same for RV 7.21.1, where *īm* also occurs after *janúṣā* and Jamison (comm.VII: ad loc.) observes “recycling and recombination” from ex. (648) and the stanza that follows it.

I have now discussed 13 of the 14 passages where I classify *īm* as a particle. In about half of these passages, the contexts in which it occurs resemble the contexts where *íd* occurs. In the other half, the contexts resemble those in which *cid* occurs. In the remaining example, *īm* occurs in a context where neither *íd* nor *cid* are found:

(649) <i>yásmād</i>	<i>indrād</i>	<i>bṛhatáḥ</i>	
REL:ABL.SG.M	Indra:ABL.SG.M	lofty:ABL.SG.M	
<i>kím</i>	<i>caném [= caná īm]</i>	<i>ṛté</i>	/ <i>vísvāni</i>
what:NOM.SG.N	PRT+PRT	without	all:NOM.PL.N
<i>asmin</i>	<i>sámbhṛtádhi</i>	<i>vīrīyā</i>	
DEM:LOC.SG.M	LP.carry:PPP.NOM.PL.N+LP	property.of.hero:NOM.PL.N	

‘Lofty Indra, without whom there is nothing, in him all facets of a hero are gathered’ RV 2.16.2ab

In this example, *īm* follows the negative indefinite pronoun *kím caná* ‘nothing’, consisting of the interrogative pronoun and the additive particle *caná* ‘not even, even’. As discussed in detail in Section 4.3.1, *cid* occurs with interrogative pronouns to form positive indefinite pronouns but it never occurs with those that are formed by *caná*. In Section 5.6.1, I showed that *íd* may follow the particle *caná*, but the latter is not involved in the formation of indefinites there. Grassmann (1873: 233) assigns *īm* the same function as after the interrogative in ex. (643) above, which is uncertain as well. I do not think that these contexts are comparable because even though the interrogative *kím* is present in ex. (649), it does not have interrogative but indefinite function. Geldner (1907–1909: I, 31) therefore assigns *īm* an indefinite function in this passage but this seems to be dubious as well. A clue towards the function of *īm* may be that it occurs after an element expressing negative polarity, as in ex. (556). Hence, I consider it possible that *īm* is again employed to decrease the tolerance of exceptions. As I have mentioned above, *íd* has this function after universal quantifiers like *vísva-* ‘all’ (cf. Section 5.4.1). This

interpretation would be in accordance with Geldner (1951–1957: I, 296), who translates ‘nothing at all’ (‘gar nichts’).⁶⁰⁰

In my examination of those text passages in which *īm* functions as a particle, the most conspicuous observation that I have made is the similarity of contexts in which *īm* occurs with those exhibiting *íd* or *cid*. The ultimate question is then what this means for the analysis of *īm*. Is this particle to be regarded as a hybrid, fulfilling functions of either *íd* or *cid*, whenever it is suitable for metrical or stylistic reasons? At least ex. (649) speaks against such an interpretation, for it exhibits a context in which neither *íd* nor *cid* are attested. Notice furthermore that also *íd* and *cid* share certain functions, such as that of an exclusive particle (Section 4.8), and also the emphatic particle *á* has been assigned similar functions to *íd* in the literature. Moreover, Section 5.2 has shown that *íd* can be employed in a manner similar to that of *u*. If *īm* also has functions similar to *íd*, this might explain why it occurs instead of *íd* in vicinity to other, possibly pronominal, instances of *īm*. This might reflect the interplay of the semantics of a particle combined with stylistic effects, which I have also shown in several examples for *íd*. As a result, I hope to have shown that *īm* should not be regarded as a mere expletive which is employed for metrical reasons or to avoid hiatus when it is used as a particle. Nevertheless, determining the precise functions is exceedingly difficult due to the low number of clear attestations of its use as a particle.

This concludes my analysis of the three forms *īm*, *ī* and *sīm*. For the latter I have not found a clear case of a particle use, so that I have not treated it further in this Section. For *ī* I have found but one such case. This case does not allow for many conclusions regarding its function but I tentatively assume that an original meaning ‘so, in this way’ is recognizable. For *īm*, I have found several examples that resemble the use of *íd* and *cid*. Especially passages like ex. (646) have led me to believe that *īm* should not be regarded as expletive when it does not have the function of a pronoun, because the contexts indicate that it does have a function in these passages.

6.3 Summary

The goal of this section has been to determine the functions of the three forms *īm*, *ī* and *sīm*. Due to the amount of discord in the literature regarding both their functions and their lexical class, I attempted to limit my study to the cases that are as clear as possible. For *īm*, I found

⁶⁰⁰ ‘Ohne welchen großen Indra gar nichts (geschichte)’.

clear cases of pronominal use and clear cases of particle use. For \bar{i} , I found only two cases of the former and one of the latter. For $s\bar{i}m$, I found only clear cases of a pronominal use but no clear case of particle use. Hale (1987: 162) claims that the primary function of $\bar{i}m$ in the Rigveda is to avoid hiatus. Indeed, I have stressed that there are no absolutely certain cases in which $\bar{i}m$ (just like \bar{i} and $s\bar{i}m$) can be regarded as a pronoun. Nevertheless, I believe that the clear cases which I have investigated in my study support the plausibility of the assumptions made in previous studies like Kupfer (2002) or Jamison (2002) that $\bar{i}m$ does in fact function as a pronoun in the Rigveda. In addition, I hope to have shown that contrary to several remarks, for instance by Jamison (comm.I.1)–(comm.X.4), also in the rare cases where $\bar{i}m$ is not a pronoun it fulfills functions apart from avoiding hiatus. Nevertheless, the distribution of the forms within the separate clauses has still not been determined clearly. Regarding the pronominal functions in Section 6.2, I only identified tendencies in several contexts. Yet, a clear factor which determines the use of either of the forms was not to be found among the prominence-lending cues that I investigated. Most striking was the strong preference of $\bar{i}m$ for masculine referents, which had already been observed by Jamison (2002). Similarly tentative are my findings regarding the use of $\bar{i}m$ and \bar{i} as particles. For $\bar{i}m$, I argued that it mostly occurs in environments that are comparable to those in which $\acute{i}d$ or cid occur. However, due to the low number of clear attestations of $\bar{i}m$ as a particle it is difficult to determine the relationship between the three forms. As for \bar{i} , in the one passage where it is used as a particle, I tentatively argued that it established a relationship between its host and the preceding clause, which would be compatible with the origin as an instrumental which it has been assigned. Nevertheless, because of problems regarding the general interpretation of the stanza in which it occurs, this remains uncertain.

7 Conclusions

In this study, I have examined the five Vedic forms *cid*, *íd*, *īm*, *ī* and *sīm*. Regarding the first two forms, I have identified their major functions. The particle *cid* functions as an additive particle (Section 4.1) as a degree modifier (Section 4.5) and as an exclusive particle (and related functions like emphatic assertion of identity, as a slack regulator etc.) (Section 4.8). It also has a totalizing function (Section 4.4). The additive function is also observable when multiple instances of *cid* occur together (Section 4.2). Together with interrogative proforms it forms indefinite proforms, together with *nū́* ‘now’ it may have the meaning ‘never’ (Section 4.3). With relative pronouns and conjunctions it marks concessive conditional clauses, and it also marks concessive circumstantial secondary predicates (Section 4.6). It possibly functions as a particularizer (Section 4.7) but it does not function as a comparative particle (Section 4.9). Its syntactic position appears to be influenced by the size of its scope but this is only a tendency rather than a rule (Section 4.10).

The particle *íd* functions as an exclusive particle and marks exhaustive focus (Section 5.1). It is also used for emphatic assertion of identity (Section 5.2), with specificatory and intensificatory function (Section 5.3), as a slack regulator (Section 5.4) and as an intensifier (Section 5.5). After predicates it can be used as an emphasizer, as a marker of epistemic modality, to emphasize a wish or with adhortative function (Sections 5.7–5.9). This function is also observable after attributes, appositions, secondary predicates and local particles. The particle *íd* is not used as a pronoun (Section 5.11). Neither is it used as a particularizer or, at least on its own, as an additive particle (Section 5.6). Its function after interrogative proforms is unclear (Section 5.10).

Comparing these functions, it is possible to draw a general conclusion regarding the difference between the two particles *cid* and *íd*: Gaedicke (1880: 234) contends that the difference in accentuation of these two forms indicates their different functions, and also Lühr (2009: 182) assumes a general distinction between stressed and unstressed particles. However, my analysis has shown that at least with respect to *íd* this is an overgeneralization. For just like *cid*, *íd* functions as a focus particle (cf. Lühr 2017) and the two particles even share several functions. Yet, I do not contend that these claims are entirely wrong, because for *íd* I have found additional functions, i.e. marking epistemic modality and emphasizing the truth of a proposition. Moreover, its stress may in fact be relevant for one of the uses of *íd*, namely that of an intensifier. For König & Gast (2006: 224) state that intensifiers “are invariably focused and therefore typically stressed”. Hence, the stressed particle *íd* is suitable for such an employment whereas the unstressed *cid* is not.

As a final remark I would like to mention that even though I have described the major functions of *cid* and *íd*, there is still a residue of passages that is difficult to explain. Consider for instance the following example:

(650) <i>ayám</i>	<i>sú</i>	<i>túbhyam</i>	<i>varuṇa</i>
DEM:NOM.SG.M	PRT	2SG.DAT	Varuṇa:VOC.SG.M
<i>svadhāvo</i>	/	<i>hrdí</i>	<i>stóma</i>
independent:VOC.SG.M		heart:LOC.SG.N	praise:NOM.SG.M
<i>úpaśritaś</i>	<i>cid</i>	<i>astu</i>	
LP.lean:PPP.NOM.SG.M	PRT	be:IMP.3SG	

‘This praise song is for you, Varuṇa, you who are of independent will: let it be set within your heart.’ RV 7.86.8ab

In this passage, where *cid* occurs after the predicate noun in an imperative copular clause, I am uncertain of its function. As is the case for *cid*, a residue of passages remains in which the presence of *íd* is difficult to explain by means of the functions that I have assigned it here.

Consider for instance the following passage:

(651) <i>yásya</i>	<i>prayāṇam</i>	<i>ánu</i>	<i>anyá</i>	<i>íd</i>	<i>yayúr</i>	/
REL:GEN.SG.M	lead:ACC.SG.N	LP	other:NOM.PL.M	PRT	go:PERF.3PL	
<i>devá</i>	<i>devásya</i>	<i>mahimānam</i>	<i>ójasā</i>	/		
god:NOM.PL.M	god:GEN.SG.M	might:ACC.SG.M	power:INS.SG.N			
[...]	<i>sá</i>	<i>étaśo</i>	/	<i>rājāmsi</i>		
	DEM:NOM.SG.M	steed:NOM.SG.M		space:ACC.PL.N		
<i>deváh</i>	<i>savitá</i>	<i>mahitvaná</i>				
god:NOM.SG.M	Savitar:NOM.SG.M	greatness:INS.SG.N				

‘Whose lead the others have followed: the gods (following) the might of the god with their power; [...]—he, the steed [Etaśa], (also) measured out the (heavenly) spaces with his greatness: god Savitar.’ RV 5.81.3

In this passage, which I discussed in Section 5.4.2, I have not been able to determine the function of *íd*. Due to the several interpretations that are at times found for the examples I have shown, it is difficult to tell how many passages exactly fall under this category for *cid* and for *íd*.

One topic which should be investigated in further research is the interaction of *cid* and *íd* with other particles. According to Kozianka (2000: 227), no other particle occurs in as many combination as *íd* (cf. also Hillebrandt 1885: 77). However, as the primary goal of Sections 4 and 5 was to establish the main functions of *cid* and *íd*, I have treated the combinations of *íd* with other particles only marginally. Another question that I have left unanswered regards the correlation of the syntactic position of *íd* and its scope. In Section 4.10, I examined the syntactic behavior of *cid* and encountered several problems regarding its interpretation. I often had to classify cases as unclear, thereby excluding them as clear counter-evidence. As for *íd*, these

problems are even more severe because, as my investigation has shown, the different functions are often indistinguishable in the given contexts. For instance, it is often not possible to distinguish whether *íd* is used as an exclusive particle, taking clausal scope, or for emphatic assertion of identity, taking local scope. Thus, a statistical analysis is liable to reflect subjective, and possibly arbitrary, interpretations. The situation is further complicated by the fact that *íd* can be used not only as a focus particle but also as a marker of epistemic modality and as an emphasizer.

Difficult as an analysis of elements whose functions are as subtle as those of *cid* and *íd* may be, the analysis of \bar{im} , \bar{i} and $s\bar{im}$ in Section 6 was even more problematic. That this would be the case became clear as early as in the review of the previous literature. In spite of my endeavor to identify their functions and to account for their distribution by isolating only the clearest examples, I have not been able to determine the factors that are responsible for their behavior. At least none of the prominence-lending cues showed any clear results.

Regarding the particle use, I have not identified a clear case for $s\bar{im}$, so that I did not investigate it further. For \bar{i} , I found only one case, the function of which I was not able to determine with certainty. For \bar{im} , I argued that it is not necessary to regard it as functionless when it cannot be an accusative, but that it is well possible to assign it certain functions. This insight causes, however, yet another problem, for it raises the question as to how the numerous ambiguous cases, i.e. those in which \bar{im} co-occurs with other accusatives, are to be analyzed. For the contexts in which the clear cases of the particle \bar{im} occur are fairly heterogenous. As a result, even though my study has made a contribution to the understanding of the forms \bar{im} , \bar{i} and $s\bar{im}$, their exact functions and distribution still remain unclear.

8 Acknowledgements

The research for this dissertation was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 281511265 – SFB 1252.

I would like to thank my supervisors Prof. Dr. Eugen Hill, Prof. Dr. Birgit Hellwig and Prof. Dr. Daniel Kölligan for their support and fruitful advice during my research. I would also like to thank especially Prof. Dr. Anna Bonifazi and Dr. Antje Casaretto for helpful comments. In addition, I thank all my friends and colleagues at the University of Cologne who supported me during my research and provided helpful comments, as well as colleagues from other universities with whom I discussed parts of this dissertation. Furthermore, I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their critical remarks. All mistakes are, of course, my own.

9 Abbreviations

References

- RIVELEX Krisch, Thomas. 2012. *RIVELEX. Rigveda-Lexikon (2 vols.)*. Graz: Leykam.
- TITUS Gippert, Jost, Javier Martínez & Agnes Korn. *TITUS. Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien*. <http://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de> (12 November 2020).
- VedaWeb Kölligan, Daniel, Claes Neufeind, Uta Reinöhl, Patrick Sahle, Antje Casaretto, Anna Fischer, Børge Kiss, Natalie Korobzow, Jürgen Rolshoven, Jakob Halfmann & Francisco Mondaca. *VedaWeb. Online Research Platform for Old Indic Texts*. University of Cologne. <https://vedaweb.uni-koeln.de> (30 April 2024).

Texts

Hdt.	Herodotus
Il.	Iliad
M	Manusmṛti
RV	Rigveda
TS	Taittirīya Saṃhitā
ŚaB	Śatapathabrāhmaṇa

Glosses

1	1 st person	M	masculine
2	2 nd person	MID	middle
3	3 rd person	INDF	indefinite
ABL	ablative	INS	instrumental
ACC	accusative	INT	intensive
ACT	active	IPFV	imperfective
ADD	additive	MOD	modal
AOR	aurist	N	neuter
AUX	auxiliary	NCTR	non-control transitive
BEN	benefactive	NEG	negative
CAUS	causative	NMLZ	nominalizer
COMP	comparative	NOM	nominative

COMPZ	complementizer	NVL	non-volitional
CONJ	conjunction	OBJ	object
CTR	control transitive	OPT	optative
CVB	converb	PASS	passive
DAT	dative	PN	proper name
DEF	definite	PO	primary object
DEM	demonstrative	POL	polarity
DET	determiner	POSS	possessive
DES	desiderative	PRT	particle
DIM	diminutive	PERF	perfect
DISTR	distributive	PFV	perfective
DU	dual	PL	plural
DTOP	discourse topic	PLUPRF	pluperfect
ERG	ergative	PRS	present
EXCL	exclusive	PST	past
F	feminine	PTCP	participle
FOC	focus	PURP	purposive
FUT	future	Q	question marker
GDV	gerundive	QUOT	quotative
GEN	genitive	R	realis
IMP	imperative	REFL	reflexive
INDF	indefinite	RDP	reduplication
INF	infinitive	REL	relative
INJ	injunctive	RPT	reportative
IRR	irrealis	SBJV	subjunctive
LV	light verb	SG	singular
IPRF	imperfect	SUP	superlative
LOC	locative	TOP	topic
LP	local particle	UQ	universal quantifier
LV	light verb	VOC	vocative

10 Appendix

This appendix contains a list of the passages that have been referred to as a group in the text but not individually. Those groups of passages all of whose members have been referred to in the text are not listed here again. The appendix is organized by sections.

Section 4.1

Passages in which *cid* follows a local particle

01.033.05	04.029.01	08.006.06	10.010.07
01.152.03	05.075.07	08.025.09	10.025.03
02.012.15	05.079.05	08.033.14	10.031.02
02.027.05	06.017.09	08.051.09	
04.011.06	07.038.03	08.066.12	
04.022.01	07.060.06	10.010.01	

Section 4.3

Passages in which *cid* follows the interrogative pronoun *ká-*

01.037.13	01.129.10	04.020.09	08.031.15
01.042.04	01.132.04	05.038.04	08.102.20
01.087.01	01.169.05	05.052.12	08.103.13
01.087.02	01.173.11	06.015.01	09.029.05
01.094.09	01.182.03	06.067.10	09.079.02
01.105.07	01.185.08	06.071.05	09.104.06
01.110.02	02.024.05	07.060.09	09.105.06
01.116.03	02.027.14	07.103.08	09.110.05
01.125.07	02.042.01	08.004.18	09.110.06
01.129.02	03.045.01	08.018.13	10.015.06
01.129.03	03.058.04	08.019.15	10.061.21
01.129.04	04.012.04	08.019.35	10.092.08
01.129.10	04.016.17	08.021.01	

Passages in which *cid* follows an interrogative adverb

01.024.10	01.184.01	06.003.03	07.104.07
01.031.02	05.007.02	07.001.02	08.040.02
01.179.04	05.074.10	07.069.02	08.073.05

Attestations of *kúcid*

09.087.08	10.004.05	10.093.11
-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages in which *nū́* (*anyátrā*) *cid* is clearly negative (without *ná*)

01.039.04	01.136.01	07.022.08	07.093.06
01.041.01	04.016.20	07.027.04	08.024.11
01.053.01	06.018.11	07.032.05	
01.120.02	06.037.03	07.056.15	

Passages in which *nū́* *cid* is clearly positive

01.010.09	06.018.08	06.039.03
01.104.02	06.030.03	08.046.11

Passages in which *nū́* *cid* co-occurs with *ná* ‘not’ or is ambiguous

01.058.01	06.066.05	08.027.09
04.006.07	07.020.06	08.093.11

Section 4.4

Passages in which *cid* follows a dual/plural demonstrative

01.080.11	05.032.09	10.022.05	10.154.04
01.179.02	06.002.09	10.154.01	
01.191.12	07.048.03	10.154.02	
03.030.05	07.053.01	10.154.03	

Section 4.6

Passages in which *cid* follows a relative pronoun

01.024.04	01.084.09	08.018.22	10.154.04
01.032.08	01.179.02	10.073.03	
01.048.14	05.029.14	10.121.08	

For the list of passages where *cid* follows *yáthā* ‘like’ see Section 4.8 below in the appendix.

Passages in which *cid* follows the conjunction *yád* ‘if, when’

01.025.01	01.029.01	05.079.05	08.045.19
01.026.06	04.012.04 ⁶⁰¹	08.001.03	08.065.07
01.028.05	04.032.13	08.008.06	

⁶⁰¹ In this passage *yád* may be a relative pronoun.

Section 4.8

Passages in which *cid* follows *yáthā* ‘like’

05.056.02	08.005.25	08.046.21	08.068.10
05.079.01	08.005.37	08.060.07	10.064.13
06.019.04			

Section 4.9

Passages in which Geldner (1951–1957) translates *cid* as ‘like’ (‘wie’)

01.041.09	03.031.12	05.002.10	08.020.21
01.086.05	03.053.22	05.030.08	08.045.11
01.169.03	03.053.22	05.031.10	08.066.08
01.173.07	03.053.22	05.056.04	09.010.08
01.173.08	04.002.07	06.030.03	09.067.30
02.033.12	04.028.05	06.035.05	10.073.02

Section 4.10

Passages in which *cid* occurs in the second position of the clause

01.006.05	02.038.02	06.004.03	08.045.14
01.024.04	02.038.03	06.011.03	08.045.19
01.024.09	02.038.03	06.015.01	08.045.32
01.025.01	03.001.02	06.019.02	08.046.21
01.026.06	03.001.09	06.019.04	08.051.09
01.028.05	03.001.13	06.022.06	08.053.04
01.029.01	03.006.07	06.024.07	08.060.07
01.031.14	03.007.10	06.024.08	08.062.03
01.032.08	03.007.10	06.028.06	08.062.05
01.033.05	03.030.05	06.030.03	08.062.11
01.033.15	03.030.07	06.037.01	08.064.05
01.034.01	03.031.09	06.038.02	08.065.07
01.037.11	03.031.12	06.045.02	08.066.04
01.037.15	03.031.16	06.048.21	08.066.08
01.038.09	03.036.06	06.049.11	08.066.12
01.040.08	03.039.02	06.051.08	08.066.12
01.041.09	03.039.03	06.053.03	08.069.17
01.048.14	03.039.08	06.053.03	08.070.07
01.049.03	03.053.22	06.062.11	08.073.02
01.051.03	03.053.22	06.073.02	08.083.09
01.051.06	03.053.22	07.004.02	08.089.04
01.051.09	03.054.04	07.004.08	08.092.10
01.052.07	03.056.04	07.008.05	08.092.27
01.052.10	03.056.07	07.011.03	08.092.29
01.055.01	03.057.01	07.018.05	08.093.10
01.059.05	04.002.18	07.018.17	08.100.05
01.060.02	04.003.04	07.018.17	08.102.14

01.061.06	04.007.09	07.018.18	08.103.13
01.062.09	04.007.10	07.018.20	09.073.09
01.064.03	04.010.07	07.019.09	09.097.27
01.070.04	04.012.04	07.020.04	09.097.38
01.071.02	04.012.05	07.020.05	09.097.52
01.072.03	04.016.03	07.021.07	09.107.02
01.080.11	04.016.05	07.021.08	10.008.01
01.080.14	04.016.06	07.023.04	10.008.09
01.084.09	04.018.01	07.028.01	10.010.01
01.085.10	04.018.08	07.028.03	10.010.07
01.094.07	04.018.08	07.032.01	10.011.03
01.094.07	04.023.07	07.032.05	10.012.05
01.101.04	04.030.09	07.034.03	10.023.04
01.107.01	04.032.02	07.041.02	10.027.20
01.110.03	04.032.03	07.041.02	10.028.06
01.116.22	04.032.13	07.045.02	10.028.09
01.116.22	04.045.06	07.048.03	10.028.10
01.117.07	05.002.07	07.053.01	10.031.02
01.120.06	05.002.10	07.057.05	10.034.08
01.121.10	05.007.02	07.058.02	10.034.08
01.127.03	05.007.10	07.058.06	10.039.03
01.127.04	05.010.04	07.059.07	10.039.13
01.127.04	05.025.02	07.060.07	10.042.06
01.129.01	05.029.04	07.060.10	10.045.06
01.129.10	05.029.12	07.068.08	10.050.02
01.133.02	05.029.14	07.070.05	10.067.11
01.135.09	05.030.04	07.085.03	10.069.09
01.148.03	05.030.05	07.090.04	10.069.11
01.165.10	05.030.15	07.099.04	10.073.06
01.169.01	05.031.02	08.001.01	10.076.05
01.169.01	05.031.07	08.001.03	10.077.06
01.169.03	05.031.11	08.001.07	10.091.12
01.173.07	05.032.02	08.004.12	10.092.08
01.173.08	05.032.03	08.004.21	10.096.10
01.173.12	05.032.04	08.005.16	10.102.11
01.176.04	05.032.05	08.005.25	10.111.02
01.178.02	05.032.06	08.005.37	10.111.04
01.179.02	05.032.08	08.006.06	10.111.05
01.179.02	05.032.09	08.007.15	10.111.05
01.180.07	05.041.13	08.007.34	10.112.10
01.180.07	05.041.17	08.007.34	10.115.06
01.180.08	05.056.02	08.008.06	10.117.02
01.185.09	05.056.04	08.008.07	10.117.09
01.187.07	05.060.02	08.011.04	10.117.09
01.191.10	05.060.02	08.018.22	10.117.09
01.191.11	05.060.03	08.020.05	10.117.09
01.191.12	05.060.03	08.020.18	10.120.04
02.010.03	05.070.01	08.020.21	10.121.08
02.011.02	05.074.04	08.020.22	10.132.03
02.012.08	05.075.07	08.021.16	10.133.01
02.012.13	05.078.04	08.024.03	10.143.01

02.012.13	05.079.01	08.024.10	10.143.02
02.015.09	05.079.05	08.026.05	10.150.01
02.023.02	05.079.05	08.027.18	10.154.01
02.026.04	05.084.03	08.027.18	10.154.02
02.027.11	05.086.01	08.027.18	10.154.03
02.030.08	06.001.04	08.033.17	10.154.04
02.033.12	06.003.04	08.033.18	10.178.03
02.038.02			

Passages in which *cid* occurs in second position after an extra-clausal element

06.010.04	06.010.04	06.017.09	
-----------	-----------	-----------	--

Passages in which a clause boundary before the host of *cid* can be assumed

01.031.13	03.009.07	05.086.05	08.025.09
01.038.07	04.029.01	06.045.02	08.045.11
01.068.07	04.043.04	06.047.13	09.087.03
01.085.04	05.018.02	06.067.03	09.097.52
01.086.05	05.030.08	07.056.20	10.005.03
01.127.04	05.031.10	07.060.06	10.025.03
01.173.05	05.041.17	07.060.10	10.039.03
01.173.05	05.054.03	08.002.35	10.131.07
02.020.05	05.055.03	08.018.05	10.144.06
03.006.02	05.067.04	08.025.09	10.176.04

Passages in which *cid* occurs in an afterthought

01.049.01	05.056.01	09.010.08	10.171.04
01.063.05	06.065.01	09.067.30	
01.132.04	08.033.14	10.027.12	

Passages in which *cid* occurs still in the initial string

01.030.04	07.095.04	10.022.05
06.002.09	08.046.27	10.073.03

Passages in which another *cid* occupies the second position

01.006.05	05.029.12	09.066.17	10.076.05
01.135.09	05.032.06	10.039.03	10.076.05
02.027.11	05.060.02	10.039.03	
03.056.07	07.041.02	10.039.03	
04.002.18	09.066.17	10.076.05	

Passages in which the scope of *cid* contains only one conjunct

01.008.09	02.023.11	05.025.02	08.068.06
01.140.11	04.010.05	06.035.05	10.041.02
01.167.07	04.010.05	06.062.09	
01.167.09	05.007.06	06.066.07	

Passages in which *cid* occurs in a loose apposition

01.063.01	06.031.02	07.098.07	08.067.17
02.027.03	07.001.22	08.011.07	10.064.13
05.002.05	07.020.01	08.020.01	
06.023.03	07.097.06	08.040.01	
06.027.04	07.097.10	08.045.13	

Passages in which the scope of *cid* contains only one expression

01.031.06	04.031.02	06.028.05	08.022.13
01.100.09	05.007.04	07.070.02	08.046.25
01.150.02	05.044.10	08.022.11	08.077.11

Passages in which the *cid* occurs in the second position after a participle construction/adjunct

01.164.06	07.060.06	09.006.09	10.008.08
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages in which the *cid* can be interpreted as ‘totalizing’ or as a degree modifier

01.004.05	03.045.02	06.022.04	07.088.05
01.081.02	03.058.05	06.028.06	08.066.05
01.100.08	04.008.03	06.045.09	08.086.05
01.127.03	04.031.08	06.049.13	09.091.04
01.168.04	05.031.10	06.065.04	10.010.01
02.030.04	05.039.03	07.056.20	10.154.04
03.035.02	05.074.08	07.056.23	

Passages in which *sma* or *ha* occupy the second position of the clause

04.003.10	04.012.06	07.018.01	10.126.08
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages in which *íd* occupies the second position of the clause

01.061.08	05.030.04	07.086.03	10.039.03
01.156.02			

Passages in which *cid* occurs in a question

01.158.02	08.021.06	10.131.02
-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages in which *cid* occurs within a secondary predicate

01.138.03	06.019.12	08.061.03	09.047.01
01.173.11	07.004.02	08.061.04	10.010.03
03.032.16	07.007.01	08.061.12	10.069.10
04.002.07	07.027.03	08.080.04	10.073.02
04.003.14	07.068.08	08.086.04	10.093.07
04.028.05	08.016.08	08.096.02	10.117.04
05.049.01	08.046.16	08.098.08	

Passages in which *cid* is adjacent to \acute{a}

01.152.03	04.011.06	07.094.11	10.096.10
02.012.15	04.022.01	08.005.30	
02.027.05	07.038.03	08.032.12	

Passages in which the *cid* functions as a beneath operator

01.129.10	03.030.02	06.066.05
-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages in which the function of *cid* is unclear

01.156.03	07.086.08	
-----------	-----------	--

Passages in which the *cid* occurs in the second position of a hemistich

08.022.16		
-----------	--	--

Passages in which the *cid* occurs in the second position of a pāda

01.054.05	05.020.01	08.018.12
01.167.02	06.017.09	10.094.02

Passages in which *cid* occurs in the second position after the caesura

01.024.08	05.033.04	06.067.05	10.023.02
01.039.06	05.033.04	07.037.07	10.073.01
01.156.01	05.058.07	07.057.01	10.147.01
02.038.03	06.024.08	07.067.02	
03.006.10	06.044.15	07.086.01	
03.035.10	06.066.01	07.087.07	

Passages in which *cid* occurs in the second position of the cadence

01.100.09	04.011.01	04.016.16	07.037.05
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Counterexamples

01.010.09	05.065.04	08.032.11	10.076.02
01.054.05	06.064.06	08.079.04	10.093.08
01.124.12	08.001.12	08.103.05	10.127.05
02.011.07	08.002.39	09.066.17	
04.006.01	08.015.06	10.069.11	

Section 5

Passages containing *céd*

07.072.04	08.079.05	10.109.03	10.146.05
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages containing *néd*

05.079.09	08.005.39	10.016.07	10.051.04
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Section 5.2

Passages containing the sequence *íd u*

01.028.01	01.061.11	04.002.04	08.024.16
01.028.02	01.061.12	04.005.03	08.045.33
01.028.03	01.061.13	04.007.09	08.061.12
01.028.04	01.061.14	04.008.04	08.066.13
01.030.02	01.061.15	04.009.06	08.069.14
01.032.15	01.123.08	04.040.01	10.002.03
01.061.01	01.156.02	05.029.13	10.016.11
01.061.02	02.024.11	05.034.04	10.027.10
01.061.03	02.035.10	06.007.06	10.032.08
01.061.04	02.037.02	06.045.06	10.081.04
01.061.05	03.004.10	07.002.10	10.086.03
01.061.06	03.005.02	07.104.21	10.127.03
01.061.07	03.031.11	08.002.13	
01.061.08	03.053.04	08.002.17	

Passages containing the sequence *íd vaí u*

01.105.02	05.073.09	08.062.12	10.137.06
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Section 5.3

Passages in which *íd* follows *iva* ‘like’

01.085.08	04.035.08	05.060.04	08.043.03
01.116.25	04.039.05	06.075.03	09.095.03
02.002.02	05.058.05	07.033.05	10.068.02
03.008.10	05.059.05	07.033.06	10.094.13

Passages in which *íd* precedes *ná* ‘like’

08.046.29	08.056.04	10.075.04	10.089.07
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages in which *íd* follows *ád* ‘then’

01.051.04	02.024.09	05.085.04	08.060.15
01.067.08	03.009.09	07.016.11	08.080.09
01.068.03	03.026.08	07.033.06	08.100.01
01.071.03	03.030.12	08.006.30	09.070.03
01.087.05	03.031.15	08.012.08	10.027.03
01.116.10	04.001.18	08.012.25	10.048.09
01.131.05	04.001.18	08.012.26	10.052.06

01.141.04	04.024.04	08.012.27	10.082.01
01.141.05	04.024.05	08.012.28	10.088.08
01.141.06	04.024.05	08.012.29	10.088.08
01.161.04	04.024.05	08.012.30	10.088.11
01.163.07	04.024.05	08.021.14	10.092.03
01.164.37	04.033.02	08.051.04	10.111.09
01.164.47	04.054.02	08.051.08	10.157.05
01.168.09	05.030.08	08.055.05	

Section 5.4

Passages in which *íd* occurs after *viśva-* ‘every, all’

01.016.08	02.023.05	07.018.14	08.100.06
01.034.02	02.023.13	07.025.04	09.048.04
01.040.06	02.024.11	07.091.03	09.098.07
01.051.08	03.029.15	07.098.01	10.020.08
01.051.13	03.054.08	08.003.16	10.035.08
01.092.03	04.001.08	08.019.14	10.039.04
01.128.06	04.004.07	08.023.13	10.049.11
01.128.06	04.022.05	08.042.01	10.050.05
01.134.06	04.030.03	08.046.12	10.112.06
01.179.03	04.040.01	08.047.04	
02.013.10	05.055.06	08.077.10	
02.023.02	06.001.09	08.099.03	

Passages in which *íd* occurs after *sádam* ‘always’

01.027.03	01.129.11	04.007.07	07.002.03
01.036.20	01.185.08	04.012.05	07.011.02
01.089.01	03.002.15	05.077.04	10.004.07
01.106.05	04.001.01	05.085.07	10.007.03
01.114.08	04.002.05	06.001.05	10.094.10
01.116.06	04.003.12	06.001.12	
01.122.10	04.003.13	06.050.09	

Passages in which *íd* occurs after *sárva-* ‘every, all’

07.033.07	07.041.05	08.057.03	10.141.04
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages in which *íd* occurs after *sáśvant-* ‘perpetual’

01.116.06

Passages in which *íd* occurs after *éka-* ‘one’

01.084.07	05.081.05	08.024.19	08.096.19
04.017.05	06.022.01	08.036.07	09.021.03
04.019.01	06.045.16	08.037.04	10.005.06
04.030.05	08.013.09	08.037.07	10.014.16

05.032.03	08.014.01	08.077.07	10.091.03
05.081.01	08.020.13	08.090.05	10.121.03

Passages in which *íd* occurs after an *āmredita*

01.046.12	01.155.04	06.042.04	10.022.15
01.123.04	02.011.11	08.002.25	10.023.05
01.132.06	02.024.05	08.051.07	10.191.01
01.132.06	04.032.04	08.068.07	
01.150.03	06.042.03	08.070.14	

Section 5.8

For a list of all passages in which a verb is followed by *íd* see the different moods below.

Passages in which the verb is accented because it occurs after a *pāda* boundary

01.004.06	05.034.04	07.031.02	08.079.05
01.009.05	05.034.05	07.032.19	08.082.07
01.179.03	06.015.01	07.058.03	08.082.08
02.011.11	06.020.13	07.085.04	08.082.09
02.011.15	06.028.05	08.001.14	10.022.15
03.032.07	06.045.06	08.019.35	10.027.04
03.053.13	06.050.06	08.026.17	10.033.08
04.009.06	07.008.05	08.031.02	10.034.05
04.029.03	07.028.05	08.045.10	10.116.08
04.044.04	07.029.05	08.047.05	10.117.05
05.030.04	07.030.05	08.076.09	

Passages in which the verb is accented because it occurs in a subclause

04.007.09	08.023.08	08.045.30
06.044.05	08.031.01	10.086.03

Passages in which the verb is accented because it occurs in a *hí*-clause

04.031.07

Passages in which the verb is accented because it occurs after a *pāda*-internal clause boundary

05.055.07	06.034.03	08.001.30
06.023.10	07.032.08	08.012.11

Passages in which the verb is accented because it occurs in a refrain/after a *pāda*-boundary

08.012.10	08.012.12
-----------	-----------

Passages in which the verb is accented due to *íd*

01.082.01	01.149.01	09.096.15	10.108.08
01.104.05	05.032.05	10.081.04	

Passages in which the verb is unaccented before *íd*

05.028.02	10.048.05	10.088.17
-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages in which *íd* follows a finite verb in the indicative

01.190.05	05.034.04	06.045.06	10.027.04
03.032.07	05.034.05	08.001.14	10.034.05
04.007.09	05.055.07	08.012.10	10.048.05
04.009.06	06.015.01	08.012.11	10.086.03
04.031.07	06.028.05	08.012.12	10.088.17
05.028.02	06.034.03	08.023.08	
05.030.04	06.044.05	09.096.15	

Passages in which *íd* follows a finite verb in the subjunctive

01.009.05	04.044.04	07.058.03	08.079.05
01.082.01	06.020.13	07.085.04	10.108.08
01.179.03	06.050.06	08.031.01	
03.053.13	07.008.05	08.031.02	

Passages in which *íd* follows a finite verb in the optative

01.004.06	07.030.05	08.045.10	10.117.05
07.028.05	07.032.19	08.047.05	
07.029.05	08.019.35	10.033.08	

Passages in which *íd* follows a finite verb in the imperative

01.104.05	07.031.02	08.076.09	10.022.15
02.011.11	07.032.08	08.082.07	10.081.04
02.011.15	08.001.30	08.082.08	10.116.08
04.029.03	08.026.17	08.082.09	

Passages in which *íd* follows a finite verb in the injunctive

01.149.01	05.032.05	06.023.10	08.045.30
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Section 5.9

Passages in which *íd* follows a local particle

01.009.10	04.002.04	08.031.15	09.059.04
01.028.01	04.005.03	08.031.16	10.016.11
01.028.02	05.003.07	08.031.17	10.017.10

01.028.03	05.029.13	08.031.18	10.023.04
01.028.04	06.028.02	08.045.31	10.042.09
01.030.02	07.001.16	08.051.07	10.089.13
01.033.02	07.004.02	08.053.05	10.093.15
01.053.07	07.032.12	08.066.04	10.127.03
01.064.08	07.104.21	08.066.15	10.191.01
01.150.03	08.002.13	08.069.14	
02.034.14	08.002.33	08.077.03	
03.005.02	08.018.14	08.093.01	
03.038.03	08.024.16	08.096.19	

Section 6

Passages in which \bar{im} is a pronoun

01.052.06	02.030.03	05.047.05	09.086.17
01.065.06	02.035.13	06.009.03	09.089.02
01.067.04	03.030.16	06.017.02	09.089.04
01.071.04	03.035.03	06.047.15	09.089.05
01.079.03	03.036.06	06.053.05	09.089.05
01.085.11	04.008.05	06.053.06	09.089.05
01.127.07	04.017.14	06.053.07	09.092.02
01.127.10	04.021.07	07.040.03	09.110.06
01.141.03	04.021.07	07.068.07	10.010.06
01.148.05	04.027.02	08.002.06	10.027.11
01.151.03	04.041.09	08.017.11	10.027.11
01.162.12	05.001.04	08.032.11	10.031.04
01.164.10	05.002.05	08.047.01	10.031.08
01.164.16	05.009.05	08.050.02	10.040.14
01.164.32	05.030.10	08.100.03	10.069.01
01.164.32	05.030.11	09.007.05	10.095.07
01.167.05	05.032.07	09.075.03	
02.026.04	05.047.04	09.077.01	

Passages in which \bar{i} is a pronoun

09.071.05	09.072.06
-----------	-----------

Passages in which $s\bar{im}$ is a pronoun

01.037.06	01.160.02	04.030.10	08.080.08
01.061.11	02.028.04	05.031.09	10.025.09
01.117.16	02.036.01	06.048.04	
01.117.19	03.056.04	07.078.02	
01.122.06	04.002.06	08.069.06	

Passages in which \bar{im} is a particle

01.129.08	01.186.06	07.021.01	08.074.15
01.144.03	01.186.08	07.032.17	09.088.02

01.145.05	02.016.02	07.056.01	
01.167.08	07.020.03	07.056.21	

Passages in which \bar{t} is a particle

01.140.02

Passages in which $\bar{t}m$ is a pronoun with a clear referent

01.052.06	02.035.13	07.040.03	09.089.04
01.065.06	03.035.03	07.068.07	09.089.05
01.067.04	03.036.06	08.002.06	09.089.05
01.071.04	04.008.05	08.017.11	09.089.05
01.085.11	04.027.02	08.032.11	09.092.02
01.127.07	04.041.09	08.047.01	09.110.06
01.127.10	05.001.04	08.050.02	10.010.06
01.141.03	05.009.05	08.100.03	10.027.11
01.148.05	05.030.10	09.007.05	10.027.11
01.162.12	05.030.11	09.075.03	10.040.14
01.167.05	05.032.07	09.077.01	10.069.01
02.026.04	06.017.02	09.086.17	
02.030.03	06.047.15	09.089.02	

Passages in which $s\bar{t}m$ is a pronoun with a clear referent

01.037.06	01.122.06	04.002.06	08.069.06
01.117.16	02.028.04	06.048.04	10.025.09
01.117.19	02.036.01	07.078.02	

Passages in which \bar{t} is a pronoun with a clear referent

09.071.05 | 09.072.06

Passages in which $\bar{t}m$ refers to the subject of the previous clause

01.052.06	04.027.02	09.007.05	09.110.06
01.067.04	05.030.10	09.075.03	10.040.14
01.167.05	06.047.15	09.077.01	
02.030.03	08.017.11	09.089.02	
03.036.06	08.050.02	09.092.02	

Passages in which $\bar{t}m$ refers to the object of the previous clause

01.141.03	03.035.03	08.002.06	09.089.05
01.148.05	05.030.11	08.047.01	10.027.11
01.162.12	07.040.03	09.089.04	
02.026.04	07.068.07	09.089.05	

Passages in which \bar{im} refers to an adjunct of the previous clause

01.085.11	04.008.05	05.032.07
01.127.10	04.041.09	09.086.17
02.035.13	05.001.04	09.089.05

Passages in which $s\bar{im}$ refers to the subject of the previous clause

01.117.16	01.117.19	02.036.01	08.069.06
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages in which $s\bar{im}$ refers to the object of the previous clause

01.122.06

Passages in which the referent of \bar{im} is not mentioned later in the hymn

01.148.05	07.068.07	08.032.11	08.047.01
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages in which the referent of $s\bar{im}$ is not mentioned later in the hymn

01.122.06	01.117.16	01.117.19
-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages in which \bar{im} refers to the last-mentioned nominal or a null-referent

01.085.11	03.035.03	09.089.02	10.027.11
01.127.10	05.032.07	09.089.04	10.040.14
01.162.12	08.002.06	09.089.05	
01.167.05	08.032.11	10.010.06	

Passages in which $s\bar{im}$ refers to the last-mentioned nominal or a null-referent

01.037.06	01.122.06	04.002.06	10.025.09
01.117.19	02.036.01	07.078.02	

Passages in which \bar{im} refers to the subject of the previous clause and both subject and object are encoded by full nominal expressions

01.141.03	07.068.07	09.089.05
05.001.04	09.086.17	

Passages in which \bar{im} refers to the object of the previous clause and both subject and object are encoded by full nominal expressions

01.052.06	01.167.05	09.075.03
-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages in which \bar{im} refers to the last-mentioned nominal, which is the subject

01.167.05	09.089.02	10.040.14
-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages in which \bar{im} refers to the last-mentioned nominal, which is the object

01.162.12	08.002.06	09.089.05
03.035.03	09.089.04	10.027.11

Passages in which \bar{im} is masculine

01.052.06	02.030.03	06.047.15	09.086.17
01.065.06	03.035.03	07.040.03	09.089.02
01.067.04	03.036.06	07.068.07	09.089.04
01.071.04	04.008.05	08.002.06	09.089.05
01.085.11	04.027.02	08.017.11	09.089.05
01.127.07	04.041.09	08.032.11	09.089.05
01.127.10	05.001.04	08.047.01	09.092.02
01.141.03	05.009.05	08.050.02	09.110.06
01.148.05	05.030.10	08.100.03	10.040.14
01.162.12	05.030.11	09.007.05	10.069.01
01.167.05	05.032.07	09.075.03	
02.026.04	06.017.02	09.077.01	

Passages in which \bar{im} is feminine or neuter

02.035.13	10.010.06	10.027.11	10.027.11
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages in which $s\bar{im}$ is masculine

01.037.06	02.036.01	06.048.04
02.028.04	04.002.06	10.025.09

Passages in which $s\bar{im}$ is feminine

01.117.16	01.117.19	07.078.02	08.069.06
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Passages in which $s\bar{im}$ is neuter

01.122.06

11 References

- Aissen, Judith. 2003. Differential Object Marking: Iconicity vs. Economy. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21. 435–483.
- Apte, Vaman S. 1957–1959. *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Revised and Enlarged Edition (3 vols.)*. Poona: Prasad Prakashan.
- Ariel, Mira. 1990. *Accessing Noun-Phrase Antecedents*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Ariel, Mira. 2001. Accessibility Theory: An Overview. In Ted Sanders, Joost Schilperoord & Wilbert Spooren (eds.), *Text Representation: Linguistic and Psycholinguistic Aspects*, 29–87. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Arnold, E. V. 1897. Sketch of the Historical Grammar of the Rig and Atharva Vedas. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 18. 203–353.
- Arnold, E. V. 1905. *Vedic Metre: In Its Historical Development*. Cambridge: at the University Press.
- Atkins, Samuel D. 1950. The Meaning of Vedic *aktú*. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 70(1). 24–40.
- Aufrecht, Theodor. 1881. Ueber *ni tundate*. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 25. 435–436.
- Aufrecht, Theodor. 1955. *Die Hymnen des R̥igveda: Dritte Auflage (2 vols.)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Bajaj, Vandana. 2016. *Scaling Up Exclusive -hii*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey PhD thesis.
- Bakker, Egbert J. 1988. *Linguistics and Formulas in Homer: Scalarity and the Description of the Particle per*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bartholomae, Christian. 1888. Beiträge zur altiranischen grammatik: V. *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 13. 54–93.
- Bartholomae, Christian. 1904. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Bauer, Brigitte L. M. 2017. *Nominal Apposition in Indo-European: Its Forms and Functions, and Its Evolution in Latin-Romance*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Bayer, Josef & Hans-Georg Obenauer. 2011. Discourse Particles, Clause Structure, and Question Types. *The Linguistic Review* 28(4). 449–491.
- Beaver, David & Brady Clark. 2003. *Always and Only: Why not All Focus-sensitive Operators Are Alike*. *Natural Language Semantics* 11. 323–362.

- Beltrama, Andrea. 2018. Metalinguistic *just* and *simply*: Exploring Emphatic Exclusives. *Proceedings of SALT 28*. 307–324.
- Benfey, Theodor. 1852–1854. *Handbuch der Sanskritsprache: Zum Gebrauch für Vorlesungen und zum Selbststudium* (2 vols.). Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Benfey, Theodor. 1855. *Kurze Sanskrit-Grammatik: Zum Gebrauch für Anfänger*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Benfey, Theodore. 1866. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: With References to the Best Editions of Sanskrit Authors and Etymologies and Comparisons of Cognate Words Chiefly in Greek, Latin, Gothic, and Anglo-Saxon*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Bergaigne, Abel. 1884. *Études sur le lexique du Ṛig-Veda. I*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Bergaigne, Abel. 1886. La syntaxe des comparaisons Védiques. In, *Mélanges Renier*, 75–101. Paris: F. Vieweg, Libraire-Éditeur.
- Bergaigne, Abel. 1895. *Quarante hymnes du Rig-Véda*. Paris: Libraire Émile Bouillon. Éditeur.
- Biagetti, Erica. 2021. *Ṛgvedic Similes: A Corpus-based Analysis of Their Forms and Functions*. Pavia: Università di Pavia PhD thesis.
- Bloomfield, Maurice. 1908. *The Religion of the Veda: The Ancient Religion of India (From Rig-Veda to Upanishads)*. New York, London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. The Knickerbocker Press.
- Bloomfield, Maurice. 1916. *Rig-Veda Repetitions: The Repeated Verses and Distichs and Stanzas of the Rig-Veda in Systematic Presentation and with Critical Discussion* (2 vols.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bodewitz, Henk. 2019. The Vedic Concepts *āgas* and *énas*. In Dory Heilijgers, Jan Houben & Karel van Kooij (eds.), *Vedic Cosmology and Ethics: Selected Studies*, 287–341. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Bodewitz, Henk W. 1991–1992. Uddālaka's Experiments with Salt (ChU. 6, 13). *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 72/73. 423–436.
- Bodewitz, Henk W. 2009. The Dialogue of Yama and Yamī (ṚV. 10, 10). *Indo-Iranian Journal* 52(2/3). 251–285.
- Boehtlingk, Otto. 1845. *Ein erster Versuch ueber den Accent im Sanskrit*. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Böhtlingk, Otto. 1845. *Sanskrit-Chrestomathie: Zunächst zum Gebrauch bei Vorlesungen*. St. Petersburg: Gedruckt bei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Böhtlingk, Otto & Rudolph Roth. 1855–1875. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch* (7 vols.). St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- Boley, Jacqueline. 2004. Historical Basis of PIE Syntax: Hittite Evidence and Beyond. Part Two: The Particles. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 109. 140–182.
- Boling, Bruce D. 1972. Some Problems of the Phonology and Morphology of the Old Irish Verb. *Ériu* 23. 73–101.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1972. *Degree Words*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- Bollensen, Friedrich. 1864. Zur Herstellung des Veda. *Orient und Occident* 2. 457–485.
- Bollensen, Friedrich. 1868. Die Lieder des Parāçara. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 22. 569–654.
- Bonifazi, Anna, Annemieke Drummen & Mark de Kreij. 2016. Particles in Ancient Greek Discourse: Exploring Particle Use across Genres. http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hul.ebook:CHS_BonifaziA_DrummenA_deKreijM.Particles_in_Ancient_Greek_Discourse.2016 (17 March, 2024).
- Bopp, Franciscus. 1847. *Glossarium Sanscritum: in quo omnes radices et vocabula usitatissima explicantur et cum vocabulis graecis, latinis, germanicis, lithuanicis, slavicis, celticis comparantur*. Berolini: Libraria Dümmleriana.
- Bopp, Franz. 1868–1871. *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Şend, Armenischen, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Litauischen, Altslavischen, Gothischen und Deutschen: Dritte Ausgabe (3 vols.)*. Berlin: Ferd. Dümmler's Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Boro, Krishna. 2021. Focus Enclitics in Bodo. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 44(1). 76–112.
- Boye, Kasper. 2012. *Epistemic Meaning: A Crosslinguistic and Functional-Cognitive Study*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Brereton, Joel P. 1982. The Particle *iva* in Vedic Prose. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 102(3). 443–450.
- Brereton, Joel P. & Stephanie W. Jamison. 2020. *The Rigveda: A Guide*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Briceño Villalobos, Juan E. 2019. *Negation, Indefinites, and Polarity in Early Greek and Indo-Iranian: A Typological and Comparative Approach*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid PhD thesis.
- Brinton, Laurel. 2006. Pathways in the Development of Pragmatic Markers in English. In Ans van Kemenade & Bettelou Los (eds.), *The Handbook of the History of English*, 307–334. Malden, MA, Oxford, Carlton, Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.

- Brinton, Laurel J. 2001. Historical Discourse Analysis. In Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen & Heidi E. Hamilton (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 138–160. Malden, Massachusetts, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Brugmann, Karl. 1904. *Die Demonstrativpronomina der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Leipzig: Bei B. G. Teubner.
- Caland, Willem. 1908. Zur Exegese und Kritik der rituellen Sūtras. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 62. 123–131.
- Caland, Willem. 1931. *Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa: The Brāhmaṇa of Twenty Five Chapters*. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- Caland, Willem & Victor Henry. 1907. *L’Agniṣṭoma: Description complète de la forme normale du sacrifice de soma dans le culte védique. Tome second*. Paris: E. Leroux.
- Canedo, José. 1937. *Zur Wort- und Satzstellung in der alt- und mittelindischen Prosa*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Cappeller, Carl. 1891. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Based upon the St. Peterburg Lexicons*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Casaretto, Antje. 2010 [2011]. Syntax und Wortarten der Lokalpartikeln des Ṛgveda: VIII: *abhí*. *Historische Sprachforschung* 123. 97–156.
- Casaretto, Antje. 2011 [2012]. Syntax und Wortarten der Lokalpartikeln des Ṛgveda: XII: *ví*. *Historische Sprachforschung* 124. 134–177.
- Casaretto, Antje. 2011. Syntax und Wortarten der Lokalpartikeln des Ṛgveda: XVI. *áti* und *tirás*. *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 8. 173–216.
- Casaretto, Antje. 2012. Syntax und Wortarten der Lokalpartikeln im Ṛgveda XXI: *purás*, *purástāt* und *purá*. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 66(1). 11–53.
- Casaretto, Antje. 2017. Zur Syntax und Semantik der ṛgvedischen Lokalpartikeln: Einige Bemerkungen zu ved. *á*. In Ivo Hajnal, Daniel Kölligan & Katharina Zipser (eds.), *Miscellanea Indogermanica: Festschrift für José Luis García Ramón zum 65. Geburtstag*, 63–75. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck Bereich Sprachwissenschaft.
- Casaretto, Antje. 2020. On Secondary Predicates in Vedic Sanskrit: Syntax and Semantics. *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 17. 1–63.
- Casaretto, Antje & Uta Reinöhl. submitted. Identifying Discourse Functions without Formal Clues: Secondary Predicates and Related Functions in Vedic Sanskrit.

- Casaretto, Antje & Carolin Schneider. 2015. Vedic Local Particles at the Syntax-semantics Interface. In Chiara Gianollo, Agnes Jäger & Doris Penka (eds.), *Language Change at the Syntax-semantics Interface*, 223–259. Berlin, Munich, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Catt, Adam. 2012. The Particle **h₂(é)u* in Vedic and Beyond: A New Proposal on Its Function and Etymology. In Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert & Brent Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference: Los Angeles, October 28th and 29th, 2011*, 47–59. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- Catt, Adam A. 2014. *Studies in Indo-Iranian Historical Linguistics*. Kyoto: Kyoto University PhD thesis.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1987. Cognitive Constraints on Information Flow. In Russell S. Tomlin (ed.), *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse: Outcome of a Symposium, Eugene, Oregon, June 1984*, 21–51. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Champollion, Lucas. 2021. Distributivity, Collectivity, and Cumulativity. In Daniel Gutzmann, Lisa Matthewson, Cécile Meier, Hotze Rullmann & Thomas E. Zimmermann (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Semantics*, 1–38. Hoboken, USA: JohnWiley & Sons, Inc.
- Channing, Eva. 1889. On Negative Clauses in the Rigveda. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 13. xcix–cii.
- Coenen, Pascal. 2020–2021 [2022]. The Functions of the Old Persian Particle =*ci*. *Die Sprache* 54. 13–94.
- Coenen, Pascal. 2023. A New Interpretation of the Vedic Particle *aṅgá*. *Bhasha. Journal of South Asian Linguistics, Philology and Grammatical Traditions* 2(1). 143–220.
- Coenen, Pascal & Michael Frotscher. 2020. The Nominative/Vocative Plural of Vedic Masculine *a*-stems in Complex Nominal Expressions. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 125. 165–215.
- Collitz, Hermann. 1882. Ueber eine besondere Art vedischer Composita. In, *Verhandlungen des fünften internationalen Orientalisten-Congresses. Gehalten zu Berlin im September 1881: Zweiter Theil. Abhandlungen und Vorträge. Zweite Hälfte*, 287–298. Berlin: A. Asher & Co. Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Cook, Haruko M. 1999. Particles. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9(1/2). 181–183.
- Coppock, Elizabeth & David I. Beaver. 2014. Principles of the Exclusive Muddle. *Journal of Semantics* 31. 371–432.
- Crespo, Emilio. 2017a. A Unitary Account of the Meaning of *kaí*. In Camille Denizot & Olga Spevak (eds.), *Pragmatic Approaches to Latin and Ancient Greek*, 257–272. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Crespo, Emilio. 2017b. Focus Adverbs in Classical Greek. In Felicia Logozzo & Paolo Poccetti (eds.), *Ancient Greek Linguistics: New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives*, 133–154. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Crespo Güemes, Emilio. 2015. Adverbios de foco en griego clásico. In José Vela Tejada, Juan F. Fraile Vicente & Carmen Sánchez Mañas (eds.), *Studia Classica CaesarAugustana: Vigencia y presencia del mundo clásico hoy. XXV años de Estudios Clásicos en la Universidad de Zaragoza*, 207–233. Zaragoza: Prensas de la Universidad de Zaragoza.
- De Cesare, Anna-Maria. 2015. Defining *Focusing Modifiers* in a Cross-linguistic Perspective. In Karin Pittner, Daniela Elsner & Fabian Barteld (eds.), *Adverbs: Functional and Diachronic Aspects*, 47–81. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- De Cesare, Anna-Maria & Davide Garassino. 2015. On the Status of Exhaustiveness in Cleft Sentences: An Empirical and Cross-linguistic Study of English *also-/only*-clefts and Italian *anche-/solo*-clefts. *Folia Linguistica* 49(1). 1–56.
- de Macedo, José M. M. 2007. *A palavra ofertada: Uma análise retórica e formal dos hinos gregos e da tradição hínica grega e indiana*. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo PhD thesis.
- de Swart, Henriëtte. 1998. *Introduction to Natural Language Semantics*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- de Vaan, Michiel. 2015. Reduplicated Demonstratives in Ancient Indo-European Languages. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 113(1). 38–52.
- Delbrück, Bertold. 1874. *Vedische Chrestomathie: Mit Anmerkungen und Glossar*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Delbrück, Bertold. 1878. *Die altindische Wortfolge aus dem Çatapathabrāhmaṇa*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Delbrück, Bertold. 1888. *Altindische Syntax*. Halle a. S.: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Delbrück, Bertold. 1893–1900. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen* (3 vols.). Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Demeke, Girma A. & Ronny Meyer. 2008. The Enclitic *-mm* in Amharic: Reassessment of a Multifunctional Morpheme. *Linguistics* 46(3). 607–628.
- Deshpande, Madhav M. 1991. Response to the Paper of Mark Hale. In Joel P. Brereton & Stephanie W. Jamison (eds.), *Sense and Syntax in Vedic*, 18–21. Leiden, New York, København, Köln: E. J. Brill.

- Ditrich, Tamara. 2011. The Typology of *Āmreḍita* Compounds in the *Ṛgveda*. *Acta Linguistica Asiatica*, 1(1), 71–83.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1999. Adjectives. In Keith Brown, Jim Miller & R. E. Asher (eds.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Grammatical Categories*, 1–8. Amsterdam, Lausanne, New York, Oxford, Shannon, Singapore, Tokyo: Elsevier.
- Doniger O'Flaherty, Wendy. 1981. *The Rig Veda: An Anthology. One Hundred and Eight Hymns, Selected, Translated and Annotated*. Harmondsworth, New York, Ringwood, Markham, Auckland: Penguin Books.
- Dowty, David. 1991. Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection. *Language* 67(3). 547–619.
- Dōyama, Eijirō & Toshifumi Gotō. 2022. *Rig-Veda: Das heilige Wissen. Sechster und siebter Liederkreis*. Berlin: Verlag der Weltreligionen.
- Dunkel, George. 1982. Autour de *á* Ṛg-Védique: A Lexical Study. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 24(2). 89–102.
- Dunkel, George. 1997a. Mono- and Disyllabic *á* in the *Ṛgveda*. In Eric Pirart (ed.), *Syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes anciennes: Colloque international - Sitges (Barcelona) 4-5 mai 1993. Organisé par l'Institut du Proche-Orient Ancien (Université de Barcelone)*, 9–27. Barcelona: Editorial AUSA.
- Dunkel, George. 2009. Lithuanian Chips from an Aptotologist's Workshop. *Baltistica* 44(1). 37–57.
- Dunkel, George E. 1981. *Āmreḍita* and Iteration of Preverbs in Vedic and Hittite. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 95(2). 214–226.
- Dunkel, George E. 1982–1983. IE Conjunctions: Pleonasm, Ablaut, Suppletion. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 96(2). 178–199.
- Dunkel, George E. 1992. Die Grammatik der Partikeln. In Robert Beekes, Alexander Lubotsky & Jos Weitenberg (eds.), *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie: Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Leiden, 31. August - 4. September 1987*, 153–177. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Dunkel, George E. 1997b. Conjunctive *u* and Invariable *sá* in the *Ṛgveda*: Questions of Method (with a Note on Greek Dialectal *övu* and *öve*). *Indogermanische Forschungen* 102. 156–178.
- Dunkel, George E. 2014. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme: Band 2. Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Durkin, Desmond. 1991. *Konditionalsätze im Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

- Eckardt, Regine. 2001 [2002]. Reanalysing *selbst*. *Natural Language Semantics* 9. 371–412.
- Eggeling, Julius. 1885. *Satapatha-Brâhmana: According to the Text of the Mâdhyandina School. Part II. Books III and IV*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.
- Elizarenkova, Tatyana J. 1995. *Language and Style of the Vedic Ṛṣis*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Emeneau, Murray B. 1980. The Indian Linguistic Area Revisited. In Anwar S. Dil (ed.), *Language and Linguistic Area. Essays by Murray B. Emeneau*, 197–249. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1997. *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi & Shalom Lappin. 1979. Dominance and the Functional Explanation of Island Phenomena. *Theoretical Linguistics* 6. 41–86.
- Esaulova, Yulia & Lisa von Stockhausen. 2015. Cross-linguistic Evidence for Gender as a Prominence Feature. *Frontiers in psychology* 6. 1–8.
- Etter, Annemarie. 1985. *Die Fragesätze im Ṛgveda*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Féry, Caroline. 2012. Prosody and Information Structure of the German Particles *selbst*, *wieder* and *auch*. In Toni Borowsky, Shigeto Kawahara, Takahito Shinya & Mariko Sugahara (eds.), *Prosody Matters: Essays in Honor of Elisabeth Selkirk*, 420–445. London: Equinox Press.
- Forker, Diana. 2016. Toward a Typology for Additive Markers. *Lingua* 180. 69–100.
- Fraser, Bruce. 1971. An Analysis of "even" in English. In Charles J. Fillmore & D. T. Langendoen (eds.), *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*, 150–178. New York, Chicago, San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Fuchs, Melanie & Petra B. Schumacher. 2020. Referential Shift Potential of Demonstrative Pronouns: Evidence from Text Continuation. In Åshild Næss, Anna Margetts & Yvonne Treis (eds.), *Demonstratives in Discourse*, 185–213. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Gaedicke, Carl. 1880. *Der Accusativ im Veda*. Breslau: Verlag von Wilhelm Koebner.
- Galjanić, Ana. 2010. Typology of Enumeration in Old Irish, Welsh and Greek. *Studia Celto-Slavica* 3. 61–76.
- Ganeri, Jonardon. 1999. Dharmakīrti's Semantics for the Particle *eva*. In Shoryu Katsura (ed.), *Dharmakīrti's Thought and Its Impact on Indian and Tibetan Philosophy: Proceedings of the Third International Dharmakīrti Conference, Hiroshima, November 4-6, 1997*, 101–115. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- García-Ramón, José L. 1998. Indogermanisch *gthen- '(wiederholt) schlagen', 'töten'. In Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert & Lisi Oliver (eds.), *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, 139–154. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Gast, Volker. 2008. Modal Particles and Context Updating: The Functions of German *ja*, *doch*, *wohl* and *etwa*. In Ole Letnes, Eva Maagerø & Heinz Vater (eds.), *Modalität und Grammatikalisierung*, 153–177. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.
- Gast, Volker & Peter Siemund. 2006. Rethinking the Relationship between *self*-intensifiers and Reflexives. *Linguistics* 44(2). 343–381.
- Gast, Volker & Johan van der Auwera. 2011. Scalar Additive Operators in the Languages of Europe. *Language* 87(1). 2–54.
- Gast, Volker & Johan van der Auwera. 2013. Scalar Additive Operators in Transeurasian Languages: A Comparison with Europe. In Martine Robbeets & Hubert Cuyckens (eds.), *Shared Grammaticalization: With Special Focus on the Transeurasian Languages*, 113–145. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Geldner, Karl. 1917. Zur Erklärung des Rigveda. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 71. 315–346.
- Geldner, Karl & Adolf Kaegi. 1875. *Siebenzig Lieder des Rigveda*. Tübingen: Verlag der H. Laupp'schen Buchhandlung.
- Geldner, Karl F. 1889. *Vedische Studien: Erster Band*. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer.
- Geldner, Karl F. 1897. *Vedische Studien: Zweiter Band*. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer.
- Geldner, Karl F. 1901. *Vedische Studien: Dritter Band*. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer.
- Geldner, Karl F. 1907–1909. *Der Rigveda in Auswahl (2 vols.)*. Stuttgart: Druck und Verlag von W. Kohlhammer.
- Geldner, Karl F. 1951–1957. *Der Rig-Veda: Aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen (4 vols.)*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2007. The Landscape of EVEN. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 25. 39–81.
- Gil, David. 1995. Universal Quantifiers and Distributivity. In Emmon Bach, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer & Barbara H. Partee (eds.), *Quantification in Natural Languages*, 321–362. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Gillon, Brendan S. 1999. Another Look at the Sanskrit Particle *eva*. In Shoryu Katsura (ed.), *Dharmakīrti's Thought and Its Impact on Indian and Tibetan Philosophy: Proceedings of the*

- Third International Dharmakīrti Conference, Hiroshima, November 4-6, 1997*, 117–130. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Gillon, Brendan S. & Richard P. Hayes. 1982. The Role of the Particle *eva* in (Logical) Quantification in Sanskrit. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 26. 195–203.
- Gippert, Jost. 2004. Indo-European Word Order in Main and Subordinate Clauses in a Diachronic Perspective. In Thomas Krisch, Thomas Lindner & Ulrich Müller (eds.), *Analecta homini universali dicata: Arbeiten zur Indogermanistik, Linguistik, Philologie, Politik, Musik und Dichtung. Festschrift für Oswald Panagl zum 65. Geburtstag*, 48–68. Stuttgart: Verlag Hans-Dieter Heinz, Akademischer Verlag Stuttgart.
- Goddard, Cliff. 2001. The Polyfunctional Malay Focus Particle *pun*. *Multilingua* 20(1). 27–59.
- Goldstein, David. 2019. Discourse Particles in LSJ: A Fresh Look at $\gamma\epsilon$. In Christopher Stray, Michael Clarke & Joshua T. Katz (eds.), *Liddell and Scott: The History, Methodology, and Languages of the World's Leading Lexicon of Ancient Greek*, 268–287. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gonda, Jan. 1952. *Remarques sur la place du verbe dans la phrase active et moyenne en langue sanscrite*. Utrecht: N.V. A. Oosthoek's Uitgevers-mij.
- Gonda, Jan. 1954–1955. Notes on the Indo-European k^u i- and k^u o-pronouns. *Lingua* 4. 241–285.
- Gonda, Jan. 1957. The Use of the Particle *ca*. *Vāk* 5. 1–73.
- Gonda, Jan. 1968a. Review of C. G. Hartman: "Emphasizing and Connecting Particles in the Thirteen Principal Upanishads". *Lingua* 20. 98–101.
- Gonda, Jan. 1968b. The Sanskrit Particle *api*. *Lingua* 21. 183–196.
- Gotō, Toshifumi. 2013. *Old Indo-Aryan Morphology and Its Indo-Iranian Background*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Grassmann, Hermann. 1873. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Grassmann, Hermann. 1876–1877. *Rig-Veda: Übersetzt und mit kritischen und erläuternden Anmerkungen versehen (2 vols.)*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Gren-Eklund, Gunilla. 1978. *A Study of Nominal Sentences in the Oldest Upaniṣads*. Uppsala, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Grieco, Beatrice. 2023a. Alcune considerazioni sui composti *āmreḍita* nella prosa tardo-vedica. In Davide Mastrantonio, Ibraam G. M. Abdelsayed, Marianna Marrucci, Martina Bellinzona, Orlando Paris, Valentina Bianchi (eds.), *Repetita Iuvant, Perseverare Diabolicum. Un Approccio Multidisciplinare Alla Ripetizione*, 99–108. Siena, Edizioni Università per Stranieri di Siena.

- Grieco, Beatrice. 2023b. On Āmreḍitas in Sanskrit: Evidence from Vedic Prose. *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 61(2), 57–87.
- Griffith, Ralph T. H. 1896–1897. *The Hymns of the Rigveda: Translated with a Popular Commentary. Second Edition (2 vols.)*. Benares: E. J. Lazarus and co.
- Guerzoni, Elena. 1997. *Why Even Ask?: On the Pragmatics of Questions and the Semantics of Answers*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology PhD thesis.
- Gundel, Jeanette K. Nancy Hedberg & Ron Zacharski. 1993. Cognitive Status and the Form of Referring Expressions in Discourse. *Language* 69(2). 274–307.
- Hale, Ken. 1983. Warlpiri and the Grammar of Non-Configurational Languages. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 1(1). 5–47.
- Hale, Mark. 1991. Some Observations on Intersentential Pronominalization in the Language of the Taittirīya Saṃhitā. In Joel P. Brereton & Stephanie W. Jamison (eds.), *Sense and Syntax in Vedic*, 2–18. Leiden, New York, København, Köln: E. J. Brill.
- Hale, Mark. 1996. Deriving Wackernagel’s Law: Prosodic and Syntactic Factors Determining Clitic Placement in the Language of the Rigveda. In Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, 165–197. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- Hale, Mark. 2007. *Historical Linguistics: Theory and Method*. Malden, MA, Oxford, Carlton, Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hale, Mark. 2017. Preliminaries to the Investigation of Clitic Sequencing in Greek and Indo-Iranian. In Claire Bower, Laurence Horn & Raffaella Zanuttini (eds.), *On Looking into Words (and Beyond): Structures, Relations, Analyses*, 289–309. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Hale, Mark. 2017–2018. The Syntax of Indo-Iranian. In Jared Klein, Brian Joseph & Matthias Fritz (eds.), *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics (3 vols.)*, 1924–1942. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Hale, Mark R. 1987. *Studies in the Comparative Syntax of the Oldest Indo-Iranian Languages*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University PhD thesis.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1967. Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English: Part 2. *Journal of Linguistics* 3(2). 199–244.
- Hartman, C. G. 1966. *Emphasizing and Connecting Particles in the Thirteen Principal Upanishads*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- Haskell, Willabe. 1885. On the Accentuation of the Vocative Case in the Rig and Atharva-Vedas. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 11. 57–66.

- Haspelmath, Martin. 1995. The Converb as a Cross-linguistically Valid Category. In Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König (eds.), *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms – Adverbial Participles, Gerunds –*, 1–55. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite Pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. Coordinating Constructions: An Overview. In Martin Haspelmath (ed.), *Coordinating Constructions*, 3–39. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Haspelmath, Martin & Ekkehard König (eds.) (1995). *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms – Adverbial Participles, Gerunds –*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, Martin & Ekkehard König. 1998. Concessive Conditionals in the Languages of Europe. In Johan van der Auwera (ed.), *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*, 563–640. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hauri, Christoph. 1963. *Zur Vorgeschichte des Ausgangs -Ena des Instr. Sing. der A-Stämme des Altindischen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Heenen, François. 2006. *Le désidératif en védique*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- Hejib, Alaka. 1984. *Áha, gha and ha in the Ṛgveda*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University PhD thesis.
- Hejib-Agera, Alaka. 1985–1986. The particle *gha* in the *Ṛgveda*. *Indologica Taurinensia* 13. 73–79.
- Hendriks, Petra. 2004. *Either, both and neither in Coordinate Structures*. In Alice ter Meulen & Werner Abraham (eds.), *The Composition of Meaning: From Lexeme to Discourse*, 115–138. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hettrich, Heinrich. 1988. *Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hettrich, Heinrich. 1991. Syntax und Wortarten der Lokalpartikeln des Ṛgveda: I: *ádhi*. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 52. 27–76.
- Hettrich, Heinrich. 2007. Materialien zu einer Kasussyntax des Ṛgveda. <https://www.phil.uni-wuerzburg.de/fileadmin/04080400/Materialien.pdf> (20 March, 2024).
- Hettrich, Heinrich, Antje Casaretto & Carolin Schneider. 2004 [2010]. Syntax und Wortarten der Lokalpartikeln im Ṛgveda IV: I. Allgemeines (H. Hettrich). II. *úpa* (A. Casaretto). III. *áva* (C. Schneider). *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 64. 17–130.

- Hiersche, Rolf. 1976. Zu ai. *éd (aid)* + Akk. „siehe (da)“ in den Brāhmaṇas. *Die Sprache* 22. 131–136.
- Hillebrandt, Alfred. 1885. *Vedachrestomathie: Für den ersten Gebrauch bei Vedavorlesungen*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Hillebrandt, Alfred. 1902. *Vedische Mythologie: Dritter Band*. Breslau: Verlag von M. & H. Marcus.
- Hillebrandt, Alfred. 1913. *Lieder des Ṛgveda*. Göttingen, Leipzig: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 1996. Demonstratives in Narrative Discourse: A Taxonomy of Universal Uses. In Barbara Fox (ed.), *Studies in Anaphora*, 205–254. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 1997. *Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase: Zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. & Beatrice Primus. 2015. Prominence Beyond Prosody: A First Approximation. In Amedeo de Dominicis (ed.), *pS-prominenceS: Prominences in Linguistics: Proceedings of the International Conference. Viterbo, Italy 12-14 December 2013*, 38–58. Viterbo, Italy: Disucom Press.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. & Eva Schultze-Berndt. 2005a. Issues in the Syntax and Semantics of Participant-oriented Adjuncts: An Introduction. In Nikolaus P. Himmelman & Eva Schultze-Berndt (eds.), *Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification: The Typology of Depictives*, 1–67. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. & Eva Schultze-Berndt (eds.) (2005b). *Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification: The Typology of Depictives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hintikka, Jaakko & Lauri Carlson. 1977. Pronouns of Laziness in Game-theoretical Semantics. *Theoretical Linguistics* 4(1-3). 1–29.
- Hock, Hans H. 1975. Substratum Influence on (Rig-Vedic) Sanskrit? *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 5(2). 76–125.
- Hock, Hans H. 1982. Clitic Verbs in PIE or Discourse-based Verb Fronting?: Sanskrit *sá hovāca gārgyaḥ* and Congeners in Avestan and Homeric Greek. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 12(2). 1–38.
- Hock, Hans H. 1989. Conjoined We Stand: Theoretical Implications of Sanskrit Relative Structures. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 19(1). 93–126.
- Hock, Hans H. 1992. What's a Nice Word Like You Doing in a Place Like This?: Syntax vs. Phonological Form. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 22(1). 39–87.

- Hock, Hans H. 1996. Who's on First?: Toward a Prosodic Account of P2 Clitics. In Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, 199–270. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- Hock, Hans H. 1997. Chronology or Genre?: Problems in Vedic Syntax. In Michael Witzel (ed.), *Inside the Texts, Beyond the Texts: New Approaches to the Study of the Vedas. Proceedings of the International Vedic Workshop. Harvard University, June 1989*, 103–126. Columbia, MO: South Asia Books.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1967. *Der Injunktiv im Veda: Eine synchronische Funktionsuntersuchung*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Hole, Daniel. 2008. EVEN, ALSO and ONLY in Vietnamese. *Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure* 11. 1–54.
- Holland, Gary. 2009. *The Vedic Particle cid: A Revised Interpretation*. Paper presented at the 14th World Sanskrit Conference. Kyoto, September 1-5, 2009.
- Hopkins, E. W. 1907. Aspects of the Vedic Dative. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 28. 360–406.
- Huijsmans, Marianne. 2019. The Scalar Exclusive Operator *?ut* in *?ay?ajuθem*: ‘No More Than’ and No Exceptions! *UBC Qualifying Papers (2015-2017)* 4. 1–16.
- Ickler, Ingeborg. 1971. *Untersuchungen zur Wortstellung und Syntax der Chāndogyopaniṣad*. Marburg: Philipps-Universität Marburg/Lahn PhD thesis.
- Ickler, Ingeborg. 1976. Die vedische Partikel *kila*. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 90.1/2. 50–86.
- Insler, Stanley. 1968. Vedic *juhuras*, *juhūrthās*, *juhuranta* and *juhurāṇá-*. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 88(2). 219–223.
- Insler, Stanley. 1974. Two Related Sanskrit Words. *Die Sprache* 20. 115–124.
- Jacobs, Joachim. 1983. *Fokus und Skalen: Zur Syntax und Semantik der Gradpartikeln im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Jäger, Agnes. 2010. *Anything is nothing is something*: On the Diachrony of Polarity Types of Indefinites. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 28. 787–822.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.I.1. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 1, 1–99). <http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.I.2. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 1, 100–191). <http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.II. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 2). <http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).

- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.III. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 3).
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.IV. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 4).
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.V. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 5).
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.VI.1. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 6, 1–29).
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.VI.2. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 6, 30–75).
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.VII. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 7).
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.VIII.1. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 8, 1–42).
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.VIII.2. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 8, 43–103).
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.IX.1. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 9, 1–67).
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.IX.2. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 9, 68–114).
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.X.1. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 10, 1–29).
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.X.2. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 10, 30–60).
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.X.3. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 10, 61–94).
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.X.4. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Book 10, 95–191).
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. comm.intro. Rigveda Translation: Commentary (Introduction).
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> [version 1-6-24] (5 February, 2024).
- Jamison, Stephanie W. 1997. Vedic *anyá-* 'another, the other': Syntactic Disambiguation. In Alexander Lubotsky (ed.), *Sound Law and Analogy: Papers in Honor of Robert S. P. Beekes on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, 111–118. Amsterdam, Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

- Jamison, Stephanie W. 1998. Rigvedic *viśvátaḥ sīm*: Or, Why Syntax Needs Poetics. In Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert & Lisi Oliver (eds.), *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, 291–300. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. 2002. Rigvedic *sīm* and *īm*. In Madhav M. Deshpande & Peter E. Hook (eds.), *Indian Linguistic Studies: Festschrift in Honor of George Cardona*, 290–312. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. & Joel P. Brereton. 2014. *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India (3 vols.)*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jasinskaja, Katja, Sofiana Chiriacescu, Marta Donazzan, Klaus von Heusinger & Stefan Hinterwimmer. 2015. Prominence in Discourse. In Amedeo de Dominicis (ed.), *pS-prominenceS: Prominences in Linguistics: Proceedings of the International Conference. Viterbo, Italy 12-14 December 2013*, 134–153. Viterbo, Italy: Disucom Press.
- Jeffcott, Valérie & Logan Neeson. 2024. The Proto-Indo-European Negative Polarity Item **k^wené*. In David M. Goldstein, Stephanie W. Jamison & Anthony D. Yates (eds.), *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference. Los Angeles, November 12th and 13th, 2022*, 61–80. Hamburg: Buske.
- Joachim, Ulrike. 1978. *Mehrfachpräsentien im R̥gveda*. Frankfurt am Main, Bern, Las Vegas: Verlag Peter Lang GmbH.
- Kaiser, Elsi & John C. Trueswell. 2008. Interpreting Pronouns and Demonstratives in Finnish: Evidence for a Form-specific Approach to Reference Resolution. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 23(5). 709–748.
- Kajiyama, Yuichi. 1973. Three Kinds of Affirmation and Two Kinds of Negation in Buddhist Philosophy. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 17. 161–175.
- Kanta, Surya. 1953. *A Grammatical Dictionary of Sanskrit (Vedic)*. Delhi: Mool Chand Kharaiti Ram Trust.
- Karttunen, Lauri & Stanley Peters. 1979. Conventional Implicature. In Choon-Kyu Oh & David A. Dinneen (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics: Volume 11. Presupposition*, 1–56. New York, San Francisco, London: Academic Press.
- Karvovskaya, Lena. 2013. 'Also' in Ishkashimi: Additive Particle and Sentence Connector. *Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure* 17. 75–97.
- Kay, Paul. 1990. Even. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 13(1). 59–111.
- Keith, Arthur B. 1914. *The Veda of the Black Yajus School: Entitled Taittiriya Sanhita. Part 2. Kāṇḍas IV-VII. Translated from the Original Sanskrit Prose and Verse*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Harvard University Press.

- Kellens, Jean & Eric Pirart. 1990. *Les textes vieil-avestiques: Volume II. Répertoires grammaticaux et lexique*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Kennedy, Christopher & Louise McNally. 2005. Scale Structure, Degree Modification, and the Semantics of Gradable Predicates. *Language* 81(2). 345–381.
- Keydana, Goetz. 2000. Prädikativa im Altindischen. In Christine Chojnacki, Jens-Uwe Hartmann & Volker M. Tschannerl (eds.), *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka: Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*, 369–378. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica.
- Keydana, Götz. 2009. Latente Objekte und altindische Diskursgrammatik. In Elisabeth Rieken & Paul Widmer (eds.), *Pragmatische Kategorien: Form, Funktion und Diachronie. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 24. bis 26. September 2007 in Marburg*, 125–142. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Keydana, Götz. 2011. Wackernagel in the Language of the Rigveda. A Reassessment. *Historische Sprachforschung* 124. 106–133.
- Keydana, Götz & Silvia Luraghi. 2012. Definite Referential Null Objects in Vedic Sanskrit and Ancient Greek. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 44(2). 116–128.
- Kim, Minju. 2015. From Choice to Counter-expectation: Semantic–pragmatic Connections of the Korean Disjunctive, Concessive, and Scalar Focus Particle *-na*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 80. 1–21.
- Kiss, Katalin É. 1998. Identificational Focus versus Information Focus. *Language* 74(2). 245–273.
- Kizilkaya, Semra. 2021. Belebtheit, Affiziertheit und das bairische Personalpronomen *eam*. In Augustin Speyer & Julia Hertel (eds.), *Syntax aus Saarbrücker Sicht 4: Beiträge der SaRDIS-Tagung zur Dialektsyntax*, 153–174. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Klein, Jared. 1997a. On Verbal Accentuation in the Rigveda. In Michael Witzel (ed.), *Inside the Texts, Beyond the Texts: New Approaches to the Study of the Vedas. Proceedings of the International Vedic Workshop. Harvard University, June 1989*, 139–166. Columbia, MO: South Asia Books.
- Klein, Jared. 2001 [2004]. Patterns of Verb Repetition in the Rigveda. *General Linguistics* 41(1-4). 222–256.
- Klein, Jared. 2002. The Syntax of Style: A Typology of Word and Morpheme-Level Repetition in the Rigveda. In Heinrich Hettrich (ed.), *Indogermanische Syntax: Fragen und Perspektiven*, 231–248. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Klein, Jared. 2013. Fashioning a Coda: Repetition of Clitics and Clitic-like Elements in the Rigveda. In Adam I. Cooper, Jeremy Rau & Michael Weiss (eds.), *Multi Nominis*

- Grammaticus: Studies in Classical and Indo-European Linguistics in Honor of Alan J. Nussbaum on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*, 143–158. Ann Arbor, New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Klein, Jared S. 1978a. The Diachronic Syntax of the Particle *u* in the Rigveda. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 98(3). 266–276.
- Klein, Jared S. 1978b. *The Particle u in the Rigveda: A Synchronic and Diachronic Study*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen.
- Klein, Jared S. 1978c. The System of Coordinate Conjunctions in the Rigveda. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 20(1/2). 1–23.
- Klein, Jared S. 1980. *Áthā, ádha* and a Typology of Rigvedic Conjunction. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 22. 195–219.
- Klein, Jared S. 1982. Rigvedic *tú* and *sú*. *Die Sprache* 28. 1–26.
- Klein, Jared S. 1985a. *Toward a Discourse Grammar of the Rigveda: Volume I: Coordinate Conjunction*. Part 2: *u*; *áthā*, *átho*, *ádha*, *ád*; *vā*; *ápi*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Klein, Jared S. 1985b. *Toward a Discourse Grammar of the Rigveda: Volume I: Coordinate Conjunction*. Part 1: Introduction, *ca*, *utá*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Klein, Jared S. 1991. Syntactic and Discours Correlates of Verb-initial Sentences in the Rigveda. In Hans H. Hock (ed.), *Studies in Sanskrit Syntax: A Volume in Honor of the Centennial of Speijer's Sanskrit Syntax (1886-1986)*, 123–143. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Klein, Jared S. 1992. *On Verbal Accentuation in the Rigveda*. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society.
- Klein, Jared S. 1994. Remarks on the Position of the Verb in the Rigveda. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 37. 97–119.
- Klein, Jared S. 1997b. The Contribution of Rigvedic Sanskrit to the Reconstruction of Indo-European Syntax: Three Concrete Cases. In Emilio Crespo & José L. García Ramón (eds.), *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy: Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft. Madrid, 21-24 de septiembre de 1994*, 253–281. Madrid, Wiesbaden: Ediciones de la Uam-Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Klein, Jared S. 1999. A Triadic Structural Feature of Nominal Anaphora in the *Rigveda*. In Jürgen Habisreiter, Robert Plath & Sabine Ziegler (eds.), *Gering und doch von Herzen: 25 indogermanistische Beiträge Bernhard Forssman zum 65. Geburtstag*, 119–134. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag Wiesbaden.

- Klein, Jared S. 2003. Āmreḍitas and Related Constellations in the *Rigveda*. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 123(4). 773–802.
- Klein, Jared S. 2012. Deictic Pronoun Repetition in the *Rigveda*. In Jared S. Klein & Kazuhiko Yoshida (eds.), *Indic across the Millennia: From the Rigveda to Modern Indo-Aryan. 14th World Sanskrit Conference, Kyoto, Japan, September 1st-5th, 2009. Proceedings of the Linguistic Section*, 59–76. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- Klein, Jared S. 2014. Conjunctive Sequences in the *Ṛgveda*. In Jared Klein & Elizabeth Tucker (eds.), *Vedic and Sanskrit Historical Linguistics*, 265–292. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited.
- Klein, Jared S. 2016. Rigvedic *u* and Related Forms Elsewhere: A Reassessment Forty Years Later. In Dieter Gunkel, Joshua T. Katz, Brent Vine & Michael Weiss (eds.), *Sahasram Ati Srajas: Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Stephanie W. Jamison*, 193–205. Ann Arbor, New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Klein, Jared S. 2019. Rigvedic *nú*: Configurational Syntax, Semantics, and Poetics. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 117(1). 35–57.
- Klein, Jared S. & Nancy L. Condon. 1993. Gothic *-(u)h*: A Synchronic and Comparative Study. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 91(1). 1–62.
- Kobayashi, Masato. 2012. Information Structure and the Particles *vái* and *evá* in Vedic Prose. In Jared S. Klein & Kazuhiko Yoshida (eds.), *Indic across the Millennia: From the Rigveda to Modern Indo-Aryan. 14th World Sanskrit Conference, Kyoto, Japan, September 1st-5th, 2009. Proceedings of the Linguistic Section*, 77–92. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- Kobayashi, Masato. 2016. The Attributive Locative in the *Ṛgveda*. In Dieter Gunkel, Joshua T. Katz, Brent Vine & Michael Weiss (eds.), *Sahasram Ati Srajas: Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Stephanie W. Jamison*, 206–215. Ann Arbor, New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Koch, Karsten & Malte Zimmermann. 2010. Focus-sensitive Operators in Nleʔkepmxcin (Thompson River Salish). *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 14. 237–255.
- König, Ekkehard. 1979. A Semantic Analysis of German ‘Erst’. In Rainer Bäuerle, Urs Egli & Arnim von Stechow (eds.), *Semantics from Different Points of View*, 148–160. Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer-Verlag.
- König, Ekkehard. 1981. The Meaning of Scalar Particles in German. In Hans-Jürgen Eikmeyer & Hannes Rieser (eds.), *Words, Worlds, and Contexts: New Approaches in Word Semantics*, 107–132. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

- König, Ekkehard. 1985. On the History of Concessive Connectives in English: Diachronic and Synchronic Evidence. *Lingua* 66. 1–19.
- König, Ekkehard. 1986. Identical Values in Conflicting Roles: The Use of German *ausgerechnet*, *eben*, *genau* and *gerade* as focus particles. *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 27. 45–74.
- König, Ekkehard. 1988. Concessive Connectives and Concessive Sentences: Cross-linguistic Regularities and Pragmatic Principles. In John A. Hawkins (ed.), *Explaining Language Universals*, 145–166. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- König, Ekkehard. 1991. *The Meaning of Focus Particles: A Comparative Perspective*. London, New York: Routledge.
- König, Ekkehard. 1993. Focus Particles. In Joachim Jacobs, Armin von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld & Theo Vennemann (eds.), *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research. Volume 1*, 978–987. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- König, Ekkehard. 2017. Syntax and Semantics of Additive Focus Markers from a Cross-linguistic Perspective: A Tentative Assessment of the State of the Art. In Anna-Maria De Cesare & Cecilia Andorno (eds.), *Focus on Additivity: Adverbial Modifiers in Romance, Germanic and Slavic Languages*, 23–43. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- König, Ekkehard & Peter Eisenberg. 1984. Zur Pragmatik von Konzessivsätzen. In Gerhard Stickel (ed.), *Pragmatik in der Grammatik: Jahrbuch 1983 des Instituts für deutsche Sprache*, 313–332. Düsseldorf: Schwann.
- König, Ekkehard & Volker Gast. 2006. Focused Assertion of Identity: A Typology of Intensifiers. *Linguistic Typology* 10. 223–276.
- König, Ekkehard & Johan van der Auwera. 1988. Clause Integration in German and Dutch Conditionals, Concessive Conditionals, and Concessives. In John Haiman & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, 101–133. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Konnerth, Linda. 2012. Additive Focus and Additional Functions of Karbi (Tibeto-Burman) =tā¹. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 38. 206–221.
- Kozianka, Maria. 2000. Partikeln und ihre Kombinationen im Ṛgveda. In Michaela Ofitsch & Christian Zinko (eds.), *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz: Festband anlässlich des 125jährigen Bestehens der Forschungsrichtung "Indogermanistik" an der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz*, 223–230. Graz: Laykam.

- Krifka, Manfred. 1992. A Compositional Semantics for Multiple Focus Constructions. In Joachim Jacobs (ed.), *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik*, 17–53. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1998. Additive Particles under Stress. *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 8. 111–128.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2008. Basic Notions of Information Structure. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55(3/4). 243–276.
- Krisch, Thomas. 1990. Das Wackernagelsche Gesetz aus heutiger Sicht. In Heiner Eichner & Helmut Rix (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 13. bis 15. Oktober 1988 in Basel*, 64–81. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Krisch, Thomas. 1997. B. Delbrücks Arbeiten zur Wortstellung aus heutiger Sicht. In Emilio Crespo & José L. García Ramón (eds.), *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy: Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft. Madrid, 21-24 de septiembre de 1994*, 283–309. Madrid, Wiesbaden: Ediciones de la Uam-Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Kuiper, Franciscus B. J. 1973. Four Word Studies. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 15. 179–204.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2005. Review of Katharina Kupfer: "Die Demonstrativpronomina im Rigveda". *Kratylos* 50. 83–89.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2012. Vedic Preverbs as Markers of Valency-changing Derivations. *Studies in Language* 36(4). 721–746.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2017–2018. The Syntax of Indic. In Jared Klein, Brian Joseph & Matthias Fritz (eds.), *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics (3 vols.)*, 377–409. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2018. The First Woman Yamī, Her Origin and Her Status in Indo-Iranian Mythology: Demigoddess or Half-human? (Evidence from Ṛgveda 10.10, Iranian Parallels and Greek Relatives). *Studia Ceranea* 8. 43–75.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2021. Old Indo-Aryan. In Götz Keydana, Wolfgang Hock & Paul Widmer (eds.), *Comparison and Gradation in Indo-European*, 385–415. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kümmel, Martin J. 2000. *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen: Eine Untersuchung der Form und Funktion einer ererbten Kategorie des Verbums und ihrer Weiterentwicklung in den altindoiranischen Sprachen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag Wiesbaden.
- Kupfer, Katharina. 2002. *Die Demonstrativpronomina im Rigveda*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften.

- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Volume I. Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Lanman, Charles R. 1912. *Sanskrit Reader: With Vocabulary and Notes*. Boston: Ginn and Company.
- Lasersohn, Peter. 1999. Pragmatic Halos. *Language* 75(3). 522–551.
- Lassen, Christianus. 1838. *Anthologia Sanscritica: Glossario instructa. In usum scholarum*. Bonnae ad Rhenum: Impensis H. B. Koenig.
- Lee, David. 1987. The Semantics of *just*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 11. 377–398.
- Lee, David A. 1991. Categories in the Description of *just*. *Lingua* 83. 43–66.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1984. *Der Relativsatz: Typologie seiner Strukturen. Theorie seiner Funktionen. Kompendium seiner Grammatik*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. 1985. Development of Conditional Clauses in Early Sanskrit. In Hermann M. Ölberg & Gernot Schmidt (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen: Festschrift für Johann Knobloch. Zum 65. Geburtstag am 5. Januar 1984 dargebracht von Freunden und Kollegen*, 231–236. Innsbruck: Verlag des Instituts für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Lejeune, Michel. 1979. Essais de philologie mycénienne: XVI. Mycénien TO-TO et védique TÁTTAD. *Revue de Philologie de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes* 53. 205–214.
- Lohenstein, Horst. 2016. Verum Focus. In Caroline Féry & Shinichiro Ishihara (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*, 290–313. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lommel, Herman. 1955. *Gedichte des Rig-Veda*. München-Planegg: Otto Wilhelm Barth-Verlag GmbH.
- Lowe, John. 2014. Accented Clitics in the R̥gveda. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 112(1). 5–43.
- Lowe, John J. 2011. R̥gvedic Clitics and 'Prosodic Movement'. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG11 Conference*, 360–380. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Lowe, John J. 2015. *Participles in Rigvedic Sanskrit: The Syntax and Semantics of Adjectival Verb Forms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lubotsky, Alexander. 1997. *A R̥gvedic Word Concordance (2 vols.)*. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society.

- Lüders, Heinrich. 1907. *Das Würfelspiel im alten Indien*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Lüders, Heinrich. 1951. *Varuṇa: I. Varuṇa und die Wasser*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ludwig, Alfred. 1876–1888. *Der Rigveda: oder die heiligen Hymnen der Brâhmana. Zum ersten male vollständig ins Deutsche übersetzt mit Kommentar und Einleitung (6 vols.)*. Prag: Verlag von F. Tempsky.
- Ludwig, Alfred. 1893. Ueber die neuesten arbeiten auf dem gebiete der R̥gveda-forschung. In, *Sitzungsberichte der Königl. Böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften: Classe für Philosophie, Geschichte und Philologie. Jahrgang 1892*, 1–176. Prag: Verlag der Königl. Böhm. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.
- Lühr, Rosemarie. 1997. Konzessivität: Im Altindischen auch eine Ausdruckskategorie? *Historische Sprachforschung* 110(1). 52–79.
- Lühr, Rosemarie. 2004. Sprechaktbegründungen im Altindischen. In Thomas Krisch, Thomas Lindner & Ulrich Müller (eds.), *Analecta homini universali dicata: Arbeiten zur Indogermanistik, Linguistik, Philologie, Politik, Musik und Dichtung. Festschrift für Oswald Panagl zum 65. Geburtstag*, 130–144. Stuttgart: Verlag Hans-Dieter Heinz, Akademischer Verlag Stuttgart.
- Lühr, Rosemarie. 2009. P2-Partikeln in indogermanischen Sprachen. In Elisabeth Rieken & Paul Widmer (eds.), *Pragmatische Kategorien: Form, Funktion und Diachronie. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 24. bis 26. September 2007 in Marburg*, 173–186. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Lühr, Rosemarie. 2010. Partikeln in indogermanischen Sprachen. *Linguistik online* 44(4). 127–151.
- Lühr, Rosemarie. 2017. Stressed and Unstressed Particles in Old Indic. In Josef Bayer & Volker Struckmeier (eds.), *Discourse Particles: Formal Approaches to their Syntax and Semantics*, 281–303. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Lühr, Rosemarie. 2018a. Information Structure in Hittite and Vedic. In Olav Hackstein & Andreas Opfermann (eds.), *Priscis Libentius et Liborius Novis: Indogermanische und sprachwissenschaftliche Studien. Festschrift für Gerhard Meiser zum 65. Geburtstag*, 283–293. Hamburg: baar.
- Lühr, Rosemarie. 2018b. Prosody in Indo-European Corpora. In, *Farnah: Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Sasha Lubotsky*, 173–190. Ann Arbor, New York: Beech Stave Press.

- Macdonell, Arthur A. [n.d.]. *Hymns from the Rigveda: Selected and Metrically Translated*. Calcutta, London: Association Press; Oxford University Press.
- Macdonell, Arthur A. 1893. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Being a Practical Handbook with Transliteration, Accentuation, and Etymological Analysis Throughout*. London: Longmans, Green and co.
- Macdonell, Arthur A. 1910. *Vedic Grammar*. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Macdonell, Arthur A. 1916. *A Vedic Grammar for Students*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.
- Maquieira Rodríguez, Helena. 2017. Algunos adverbios de Inclusión y de "escala" en los oradores clásicos. In Ivo Hajnal, Daniel Kölligan & Katharina Zipser (eds.), *Miscellanea Indogermanica: Festschrift für José Luis García Ramón zum 65. Geburtstag*, 433–442. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck Bereich Sprachwissenschaft.
- Martínez, Rafael. 2014. Adverbios de foco en griego antiguo: $\mu\acute{o}\nu\upsilon\upsilon$ frente a $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ en la prosa historiográfica clásica y helenística. *Estudios griegos e indoeuropeos* 24. 17–37.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1992–2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen (3 vols.)*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.
- Miller, Jeanine G. 1978. *The Vision of Ṛta in the Vedas*. Durham: University of Durham MLitt thesis.
- Minard, Armand. 1956. *Trois énigmes sur les cent chemins: Recherches sur le Śatapatha-Brahmaṇa. Tome II*. Paris: E. de Boccard, Éditeur.
- Mitchiner, John E. 2000. *Traditions of the seven Ṛṣis*. Delhi: Motilal Banarisdass Publishers Private Limited.
- Monier-Williams, Monier. 1872. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Greek, Latin, Gothic, German, Anglo-Saxon and Other Cognate Indo-European Languages*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.
- Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.
- Morzycki, Marcin. 2012. Adjectival Extremeness: Degree Modification and Contextually Restricted Scales. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 30(2). 567–609.
- Müller, F. M. 1891. *Vedic Hymns: Part I. Hymns to the Maruts, Rudra, Vāyu and Vāta*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.
- Mumm, Peter-Arnold. 2004. Altindisch *sma*: Teil 1: Rig- und Atharvaveda. *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 1. 19–68.

- Nekula, Marek. 1996. *System der Partikeln im Deutschen und Tschechischen: Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Abtönungspartikeln*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Nevalainen, Terttu. 1991. *BUT, ONLY, JUST: Focusing Adverbial Change in Modern English 1500-1900*. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1978. Secondary Predicates. *Berkley Linguistics Society* 4. 114–127.
- Oertel, Hanns. 1941. *Die Dativi finales abstrakter Nomina und andere Beispiele nominaler Satzfügung in der vedischen Prosa*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1888. *Die Hymnen des R̥gveda: Band I. Metrische und textgeschichtliche Prolegomena*. Berlin: Verlag von Wilhelm Hertz.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1894. *Die Religion des Veda*. Berlin: Verlag von Wilhelm Hertz.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1897. *Vedic Hymns: Part II. Hymns to Agni (Mandalas I-V)*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1906. Vedische Untersuchungen. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 60. 707–758.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1907. Vedische Untersuchungen. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 61. 803–836.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1909–1912. *R̥gveda: Textkritische und exegetische Noten (2 vols.)*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Olivelle, Patrick. 2005. *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmāsāstra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Orqueda, Véronica. 2017. Svá- como intensificador en védico. *ONOMÁZEIN* 36. 159–182.
- Osthoff, Hermann. 1879. *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen: Zweiter Theil*. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel.
- Osthoff, Hermann. 1881. *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen: Vierter Theil*. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel.
- Otto, Rudolf. 1948. *Varuna-Hymnen des Rig-Veda*. Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag.
- Ozerov, Pavel. 2014. *The System of Information Packaging in Colloquial Burmese*. Bundoora, Victoria: La Trobe University PhD thesis.
- Paczkowski, Andrew. 2012. Investigating Vedic *íd*. In Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert & Brent Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference: Los Angeles, October 28th and 29th, 2011*, 125–134. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- Paradis, Carita. 1997. *Degree Modifiers of Adjectives in Spoken British English*. Lund: Lund University Press.

- Passer, Matthias B. 2016. Tracking the Lost: Information Structure and Object Deletion in Older Indo-European Languages. In Sergio Neri, Roland Schuhmann & Susanne Zeilfelder (eds.), »dat ih dir it nu bi huldi gibu«: *Linguistische, germanistische und indogermanistische Studien Rosemarie Lühr gewidmet*, 341–362. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Patil, Umesh, Peter Bosch & Stefan Hinterwimmer. 2020. Constraints on German *diese* Demonstratives: Language Formality and Subject-avoidance. *Glossa* 5(1). 1–22.
- Paul, Hermann. 2002. *Deutsches Wörterbuch: Bedeutungsgeschichte und Aufbau unseres Wortschatzes. 10. Überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage von Helmut Henne, Heirdun Kämper und Georg Objartel*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Persson, Per. 1893. Über den demonstrativen Pronominalstamm *no-* *ne-* und Verwandtes. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 2. 199–260.
- Pinault, Georges. 1985 [1986]. Négation et comparaison en védique. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 80(1). 103–144.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1995–1996. Distribution des particules comparatives dans la Ṛk-Saṃhitā. *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 13-14. 307–367.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1997. Le substantif épithète dans la langue de la Ṛk-Saṃhitā. In Eric Pirart (ed.), *Syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes anciennes: Colloque international - Sitges (Barcelona) 4-5 mai 1993. Organisé par l'Institut du Proche-Orient Ancien (Université de Barcelone)*, 111–141. Barcelona: Editorial AUSA.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2012. Sur l'hymne védique dialogué de Yama et Yamī (RV X.10). In Samra Azarnouche & Céline Redard (eds.), *Yama / Yima: Variations indo-iraniennes sur la geste mythique*, 139–178. Paris: Édition-Diffusion de Boccard.
- Pirart, Eric. 1997. Avestique *hīm*. In Eric Pirart (ed.), *Syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes anciennes: Colloque international - Sitges (Barcelona) 4-5 mai 1993. Organisé par l'Institut du Proche-Orient Ancien (Université de Barcelone)*, 143–160. Barcelona: Editorial AUSA.
- Pirart, Éric. 1995. *Les Nāsatya: Volume I. Les noms des Aśvin. Traduction commentée des strophes consacrées aux Aśvin dans le premier maṇḍala de la Ṛgvedasaṃhitā*. Genève: Librairie DROZ S.A.
- Pischel, Richard. 1889. *Vedische Studien: Erster Band*. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer.
- Pischel, Richard. 1897. *Vedische Studien: Zweiter Band*. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer.
- Pooth, Roland & Verónica Orqueda. 2021. Alignment Change and the Emergence of the Thematic Conjugation from Proto-Indo-European to Indo-European: A Wedding of Hypotheses. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 119(2). 107–151.

- Pott, August F. 1879. Das indogermanische Pronomen. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 33. 1–81.
- Primus, Beatrice. 2009. Case, Grammatical Relations, and Semantic Roles. In Andrej L. Malchukov & Andrew Spencer (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Case*, 261–275. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Primus, Beatrice. 2012. *Semantische Rollen*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985 [2008]. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Ram-Prasad, Krishnan. 2023. Clitics and the Left Periphery in the Sanskrit of the Rigveda. *Journal of Historical Syntax* 7. 1–53.
- Reinöhl, Uta. 2016. *Grammaticalization and the Rise of Configurationality in Indo-Aryan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reinöhl, Uta & Antje Casaretto. 2018. When Grammaticalization Does NOT Occur: Prosody-syntax Mismatches in Indo-Aryan. *Diachronica* 35(2). 238–276.
- Renou, Louis. 1946 [1947]. Sur la phrase négative dans le Rgveda. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 43. 43–49.
- Renou, Louis. 1952. *Grammaire de la langue védique*. Lyon, Paris: IAC.
- Renou, Louis. 1955–1969. *Études védiques et pāṇinéennes (17 vols.)*. Paris: E. de Boccard; Institut de Civilisation Indienne de l'Université de Paris.
- Renou, Louis. 1956. *Hymnes spéculatifs du Véda*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Renou, Louis. 1959. Review of Manfred Mayrhofer: "Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen". *Kratylos* 4. 42–46.
- Ricca, Davide. 2017. Meaning both 'also' and 'only'? The Intriguing Polysemy of Old Italian *pur(e)*. In Anna-Maria De Cesare & Cecilia Andorno (eds.), *Focus on Additivity: Adverbial Modifiers in Romance, Germanic and Slavic Languages*, 45–76. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Rinas, Karsten. 2006. *Die Abtönungspartikeln doch und ja: Semantik, Idiomatisierung, Kombinationen, tschechische Äquivalente*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften.
- Rodríguez Adrados, Francisco. 1992. *Védico y Sánscrito Clásico: Gramática, textos, anotados y vocabulario etimológico. 2.^a Edición*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Rooth, Mats. 1992. A Theory of Focus Interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1(1). 75–116.

- Rooth, Mats E. 1985. *Association with Focus*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts PhD thesis.
- Rosen, Fridericus. 1830. *Rig-Vedæ specimen*. Londini: Impensis Joannis Taylor.
- Roth, Rudolph. 1894. Rechtschreibung im Veda. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 48. 676–684.
- Rullmann, Hotze. 1997. Even, Polarity and Scope. *Papers in Experimental and Theoretical Linguistics* 4. 40–64.
- Sarup, Lakshman. 1967. *The Nighaṅṭu and the Nirukta: The Oldest Indian Treatise on Etymology, Philology, and Semantics*. Delhi, Varanasi, Pantā: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Sastri, P. S. 1947. Figures of Speech in the Ṛgveda. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 28(1/2). 34–64.
- Scarlata, Salvatore. 1999. *Die Wurzelkomposita im Ṛg-Veda*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag Wiesbaden.
- Schäufele, Steven. 1988. Where's my NP?: Non-transformational Analyses of Vedic Pronominal Fronting. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 18(2). 129–162.
- Schäufele, Steven. 1991a. Single-word Topicalization in Vedic Prose: A Challenge to Government & Binding? In Hans H. Hock (ed.), *Studies in Sanskrit Syntax: A Volume in Honor of the Centennial of Speijer's Sanskrit Syntax (1886-1986)*, 153–175. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Schäufele, Steven. 1993. The Vedic Clause-initial String and Universal Grammar. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 23(1). 131–161.
- Schäufele, Steven. 1996. Now That We're All Here, Where Do We Sit?: Phonological Ordering in the Vedic Clause-Initial String. In Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.), *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, 447–475. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- Schäufele, Steven W. 1991b. *Free Word-order syntax: The Challenge from Vedic Sanskrit to Contemporary Formal Syntactic Theory*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois PhD thesis.
- Schmidt, Hanns-Peter. 1968. *Brhaspati und Indra: Untersuchungen zur vedischen Mythologie und Kulturgeschichte*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Schnaus, Susanne. 2008. *Die Dialoglieder im altindischen Rigveda: Kommentar unter besonderer Berücksichtigung textlinguistischer Kriterien*. Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač.
- Schnaus, Susanne & Natalia Mull. 2016. Informationsstruktur und Wortstellungsvarianz in altindogermanischen Sprachen. In Rosemarie Lühr (ed.), *Idiosynkrasie: Neue Wege ihrer Beschreibung*, 101–111. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag Wiesbaden.

- Schneider, Carolin. 2009 [2010]. Syntax und Wortarten der Lokalpartikeln des Ṛgveda V: *ní*. *Historische Sprachforschung* 122. 118–169.
- Schneider, Carolin. 2012. Local Particles in the Ṛgveda: Part XVII. *pārā*. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 66(2). 221–246.
- Schneider, Carolin. 2013a. Syntax und Wortarten der Lokalpartikeln des Ṛgveda: Folge XI. *sám*. *Historische Sprachforschung* 126. 142–206.
- Schneider, Carolin. 2013b. Syntax und Wortarten der Lokalpartikeln im Ṛgveda: *ápi* (Folge XX). *Indogermanische Forschungen* 118. 23–53.
- Schneider, Ulrich. 1967–1968. Yama und Yamī (RV X 10). *Indo-Iranian Journal* 10(1). 1–32.
- Schultze-Berndt, Eva & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann. 2004. Depictive Secondary Predicates in Crosslinguistic Perspective. *Linguistic Typology* 8. 59–131.
- Schumacher, Petra B. Manuel Dangl & Elyesa Uzun. 2016. Thematic Role as Prominence Cue During Pronoun Resolution. In Anke Holler & Katja Suckow (eds.), *Empirical Perspectives on Anaphora Resolution*, 213–239. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Schumacher, Petra B. Leah Roberts & Juhani Järkvikivi. 2017. Agentivity Drives Real-time Pronoun Resolution: Evidence from German *er* and *der*. *Lingua* 185. 25–41.
- Schwenter, Scott A. & Shrvan Vasishth. 2000. Absolute and Relative Scalar Particles in Spanish and Hindi. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 26(1). 225–233.
- Schwyzler, Eduard. 1939. *Griechische Grammatik: Auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik. Erster Band. Allgemeiner Teil. Lautlehre. Wortbildung. Flexion*. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Shank, Scott. 2004. *Domain Widening*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia PhD thesis.
- Sieg, Emil. 1902. *Die Sagenstoffe des Ṛgveda: Und die indische Itihâsâtrâditiôn*. Stuttgart: Druck und Verlag von W. Kohlhammer.
- Simon-Vandenberg, Anne-Marie. 2008. *Almost certainly* and *most definitely*: Degree Modifiers and Epistemic Stance. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40. 1521–1542.
- Speijer, Jakob S. 1886. *Sanskrit Syntax*. Leyden: E. J. Brill.
- Speyer, Jakob S. 1896. *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Sudhoff, Stefan. 2010. *Focus Particles in German: Syntax, Prosody, and Information Structure*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Taglicht, Josef. 1984. *Message and Emphasis: On Focus and Scope in English*. London, New York: Longman.
- Thieme, Paul. 1938. *Der Fremdling im R̥gveda: Eine Studie über die Bedeutung der Worte ari, arya, aryaman und ārya*. Leipzig: Kommissionsverlag F. A. Brockhaus.
- Thieme, Paul. 1949. *Untersuchungen zur Wortkunde und Auslegung des Rigveda*. Halle/Saale: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Thieme, Paul. 1953. Review of D. J. Hoens. Śānti: "A Contribution to Ancient Indian Religious Terminology I. Śānti in the Saṃhitās, the Brāhmaṇas and the Śrautasūtras". *Oriens* 6(2). 395–401.
- Thieme, Paul. 1964. *Gedichte aus dem Rig-Veda*. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam Jun. Stuttgart.
- Thomson, Karen. 2004. The Decipherable Rigveda: A Reconsideration of *vakṣāṇā*. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 109. 112–139.
- Thumb, Albert & Richard Hauschild. 1958–1959. *Handbuch des Sanskrit: Mit Texten und Glossar. Eine Einführung in das sprachwissenschaftliche Studium des Altindischen I. Teil: Grammatik. 1. Einleitung und Lautlehre. II. Teil: Formenlehre. Dritte stark umgearbeitete Auflage*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Tichy, Eva. 1995a. *Die Nomina agentis auf -tar- im Vedischen*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.
- Tichy, Eva. 1995b. Vedisch *éd*: Funktion, Herkunft und subordinierende Transpositionen. In Heinrich Hettrich, Wolfgang Hock, Peter-Arnold Mumm & Norbert Oettinger (eds.), *Verba et structurae: Festschrift für Klaus Strunk zum 65. Geburtstag*, 319–343. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Tichy, Eva. 2002. Zur Funktion und Vorgeschichte der indogermanischen Modi. In Heinrich Hettrich (ed.), *Indogermanische Syntax: Fragen und Perspektiven*, 189–206. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Tichy, Eva. 2004. *Indogermanistisches Grundwissen für Studierende sprachwissenschaftlicher Disziplinen*. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- Tichy, Eva. 2006. *Der Konjunktiv und seine Nachbarkategorien: Studien zum indogermanischen Verbum, ausgehend von der älteren vedischen Prosa*. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.
- Tikkanen, Bertil. 1987. *The Sanskrit Gerund: A Synchronic, Diachronic and Typological Analysis*. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society.

- Tomaszewicz, Barbara. 2012. A Scalar Opposite of *Scalar Only*. In Nathan Arnett & Ryan Bennett (eds.), *Proceedings of the 30th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 324–334. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Tomaszewicz, Barbara. 2013. Focus Sensitive Intensifiers in Slavic: *Az/Čak* in Contrast to *Even* and *Only*. In Alexander Podobryaev (ed.), *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 20*, 275–289. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2006. The Semantic Development of Scalar Focus Modifiers. In Ans van Kemenade & Bettelou Los (eds.), *The Handbook of the History of English*, 335–359. Malden, MA, Oxford, Carlton, Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.
- Umbach, Carla. 2004. On the Notion of Contrast in Information Structure and Discourse Structure. *Journal of Semantics* 21(2). 155–175.
- van Nooten, Barend A. & Gary B. Holland. 1994. *Rig Veda: A Metrically Restored Text with an Introduction and Notes*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: Harvard University Press.
- van Os, Charles. 1986. Partikelhäufung und Ausdrucksverstärkung. *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 27. 122–132.
- Varma, Terry. 2006. Some Aspects of the Meaning of the Hindi Particle *hii*. In Rajendra Singh (ed.), *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics 2006*, 87–122. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Velankar, Hari D. 1947–1948. Hymns to Indra in Maṇḍala VIII: Nos. 76-78; 80-82; 88-93; 95-100. *Journal of the University of Bombay* 16. 1–18.
- Velankar, Hari D. 1948. Hymns to Indra in Maṇḍala I: 4-11, 16, 29, 30, 32, 33, 51-57. Translated and Briefly Annotated. *Journal of the University of Bombay* 17(2). 1–22.
- Velankar, Hari D. 1951. Hymns to Indra in Maṇḍala I: 129-133; 165; 169-171; 173-178. Translated into English and Briefly Annotated. *Journal of the University of Bombay* 20(2). 17–34.
- Velankar, Hari D. 1954. Hymns to Indra in Mandala X: Nos. 105, 111, 112, 113, 116, 119, 120, 131, 133, 134, 138, 144, 147, 148, 152, 153, 160, 167, 171, 179, 180. Translated into English and Briefly Annotated. *Journal of the University of Bombay* 23(2). 1–18.
- Velankar, Hari D. 1955. Hymns to Agni in Maṇḍala VI. *Journal of the University of Bombay* 24(2). 36–64.
- Velankar, Hari D. 1957. Agni Hymns in Maṇḍala VIII: Translated and Briefly Annotated. Nos. 11, 19, 23, 39, 43, 44, 60, 71, 74, 75, 84, 102, 103. *Journal of the University of Bombay* 26(2). 1–24.

- Velankar, Hari D. 1958. Hymns to Agni in Maṇḍala X (1–80): 1-8, 11-12, 20-21, 45-46, 51-52, 69-70, 79-80. Translated into English and Briefly Annotated. *Journal of the University of Bombay* 27(2). 1–28.
- Velankar, Hari D. 1959. Hymns to Agni in Maṇḍala X: Translated into English and Briefly Annotated. 87-88, 91, 110, 115, 118, 122, 124, 140, 150, 156, 176, 187-88. *Journal of the University of Bombay* 28(2). 1–19.
- Velankar, Hari D. 1960. Hymns to Agni in Maṇḍala I: 1, 12-13, 26-27, 31, 36, 44-45, 58-60. Translated into English and Briefly Annotated. *Journal of the University of Bombay* 29(2). 1–18.
- Velankar, Hari D. 1963a. Hymns to Agni in Maṇḍala I: 94-99; 127-128; 140-150; 188-189. Translated into English and Briefly Annotated. *Journal of the University of Bombay* 32(2). 1–36.
- Velankar, Hari D. 1963b. *Ṛgveda Maṇḍala VII: Introduction, Devanāgarī Text, English Translation, Critical Notes, Select Glossary and Three Indices*. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.
- Velankar, Hari D. 2003. *The Fifth Maṇḍala of the Ṛg-Veda: With English Translation and Critical Notes*. Dehli, India: Koshal Book Depot.
- Viti, Carlotta. 2007. *Strategies of Subordination in Vedic*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Viti, Carlotta. 2008a. The Phylogenesis of Hypotaxis in Vedic. *Diachronica* 25(3). 386–409.
- Viti, Carlotta. 2008b. The Verb-Initial Word Order in the Early Poetry of Vedic and Ancient Greek. In Karlene Jones-Bley, Martin E. Huld, Angela Della Volpe & Miriam Robbins Dexter (eds.), *Proceedings of the 19th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference: Los Angeles, November 2-3, 2006 (selected papers)*, 89–111. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Viti, Carlotta. 2009. A Quantitative Analysis of the OSV Word Order in Vedic. In Elisabeth Rieken & Paul Widmer (eds.), *Pragmatische Kategorien: Form, Funktion und Diachronie. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 24. bis 26. September 2007 in Marburg*, 307–322. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Viti, Carlotta. 2010. The Information Structure of OVS in Vedic. In Gisella Ferraresi & Rosemarie Lühr (eds.), *Diachronic Studies on Information Structure: Language Acquisition and Change*, 37–62. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- Viti, Carlotta. 2016. Null Objects and Clitics in Some Early Indo-European Languages. In Rosemarie Lühr (ed.), *Idiosynkrasie: Neue Wege ihrer Beschreibung*, 13–32. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag Wiesbaden.

- von Bradke, Peter. 1892. Ein lustiges Wagenrennen in Altindien, RV. 10, 102. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 46. 445–465.
- von Bradke, Peter. 1893. Von der Marut wunderbarer Geburt, RV. 6,66. In Ernst Kuhn (ed.), *Festgruss an Rudolf von Roth zum Doktor-Jubiläum*, 117–125. Stuttgart: Druck und Verlag von W. Kohlhammer.
- von Heusinger, Klaus. 2011. Specificity. In Klaus von Heusinger, Claudia Maienborn & Paul Portner (eds.), *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning. Volume 2*, 1025–1058. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- von Heusinger, Klaus. 2019. Indefiniteness and Specificity. In Jeanette Gundel & Barbara Abbott (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Reference*, 146–167. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- von Heusinger, Klaus & Petra B. Schumacher. 2019. Discourse Prominence: Definition and Application. *Journal of Pragmatics* 154. 117–127.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1879. Ueber einige enclitische nebenformen der personalpronomina. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 24(6). 592–609.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1881. Zum zahlwort. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen* 25(3). 260–291.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1892. Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1. 333–436.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1896. *Altindische Grammatik: I. Lautlehre*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Wackernagel, Jacob & Albert Debrunner. 1930. *Altindische Grammatik: III. Band: Nominalflexion - Zahlwort - Pronomen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Watanabe, Honoré. 2003. *A Morphological Description of Sliammon, Mainland Comox Salish: With a Sketch of Syntax*. Kyoto: Nakanishi Printing Co., Ltd.
- Weber, Albrecht. 1865. Ueber Haug's Aitareya-Brâhmana. In Albrecht Weber (ed.), *Indische Studien: Beiträge für die Kunde des indischen Alterthums. Neunter Band*, 210–380. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Wenthe, Mark. 2012. On the Syntax of Rigvedic Accusative Enclitic Pronouns. In Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert & Brent Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference: Los Angeles, October 28th and 29th, 2011*, 175–196. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.

- West, Martin L. 2011. *Old Avestan Syntax and Stylistics: With an Edition of the Texts*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Whitney, William D. 1889. *Sanskrit Grammar: Including both the Classical Language, and the Older Dialects, of Veda and Brahmana*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Wiegand, Mia. 2018. Exclusive Morphosemantics: *Just* and Covert Quantification. In William G. Bennett, Lindsay Hrats & Dennis R. Storoshenko (eds.), *Proceedings of the 35th West Coast Conference on formal linguistics*, 419–429. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1986. Precision in Vagueness: The Semantics of English 'Approximatives'. *Journal of Pragmatics* 10. 597–613.
- Wilkinson, Karina. 1996. The Scope of *even*. *Natural Language Semantics* 4. 193–215.
- Wilson, Horace H. 1857. *Rig-Veda Sanhita: A Collection of Ancient Hindu Hymns, Constituting the Third and Fourth Ashtakas, or Books*. London: Wm. H. Allen and co.
- Witzel, Michael & Toshifumi Gotō. 2007. *Rig-Veda: Das heilige Wissen. Erster und zweiter Liederkreis*. Frankfurt am Main, Leipzig: Verlag der Weltreligionen.
- Witzel, Michael, Toshifumi Gotō & Salvatore Scarlata. 2013. *Rig-Veda: Das heilige Wissen*. Berlin: Verlag der Weltreligionen.
- Ying, Zhang. 2017. The Categorization of *Dou* (都) in Chinese: A Study from a Cross-linguistic Perspective. *Bulletin of Chinese Linguistics* 10. 214–234.
- Young, Katherine K. 2009. Fate Hangs on a Particle: The Hermeneutics of Bhagavadgītā 9:32-3. *The Journal of Hindu Studies* 2(2). 229–241.
- Zifonun, Gisela, Ludger Hoffmann & Bruno Strecker. 1997. *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache (3 vols.)*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Zimmermann, Malte. 2011. Discourse Particles. In Klaus von Heusinger, Claudia Maienborn & Paul Portner (eds.), *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning. Volume 2*, 2012–2038. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.