

On RV 8.52.4

by Daniel Kölligan

1. In the *Vālakkilya*-hymn no. 4 the 3rd verse talks about Indra making the songs of praise his own, drinking soma and having Viṣṇu make his three world-creating strides:

yá ukthá kévalā dadhé yáḥ sómam dhr̥ṣitáḥpibat
yásmai viṣṇus tr̥ṇi padá vicakramá úpa mitrásya dhármabhiḥ

“who makes the praises his own (*kevala-*), who has drunk the soma boldly,
to whom Viṣṇu strode his three strides with/according to the rules of Mitra”

In the following verse the initial relative pronoun *yasya* is unexpected and does not seem to have any referent:

yásya tvám indra stómeṣu cākáno váje vājiñ chatakrato
tám tvā vayám sudúgbām iva godúho jubūmási śravasyávaḥ

As *yásya* is connected with *stomeṣu* it would seem natural to think of the poet as being referred to by it, which is, in fact, Geldner’s interpretation (“*yásya* (des Sängers)”).¹ But there is no corresponding noun in the context to support this view. Rather, in the second line the subject is the 1st person plural pronoun *vayám* which would lead us to expect *yeṣam* in the first line: “in whose praises (i.e. ours) you took delight”.

¹ Cf. also Oldenberg (1909:II. 119): “Bemerke Konstruktion: v. 3 Relativsätze auf Indra gehend; v. 4 auch Relativsatz, aber Beziehung auf Opferer.”

2. A possible solution² might be to take *yāsya* as an objective genitive with Indra as the underlying object of praise.³ A translation might thus run:

“in whose praises (i.e. in praises of you) you, Indra, would/should take delight, o mighty one, at the great deed, o you of hundred powers. You (being thus/as such) we call (and have always called) like shepherds call the cow (giving good milk), desiring fame.”

yāsya would then directly be connected with the preceding verse talking of various deeds done by Indra and would be in parallel to the preceding two relative pronouns also referring to Indra (‘who makes the praises his own’, ‘for whom Vishnu strode his three strides’). Furthermore, it would give the whole verse a well-known overall structure of preceding relative clause followed by the main clause with coreferent pronouns: *yāsya ... tam* (both=Indra) as in

RV 8.51.5 *yó no dātā vásūnām, indram tam hūmabe vayám*
 “who is our giver of riches, this Indra we call.”⁴,

which would not be the case if one assumed with Geldner that the underlying subject of *yāsya* is the poet. In the latter case, one must also assume an

² Arnold (1905: 313) proposed an emendation of the line, since *yāsya tuám* “gives an irregular opening and break”, to *yāsya stómeṣu tuám indra*. This was classified by Oldenberg loc. cit. as “sehr gewagt”. This does not seem to imply a different interpretation of the genitive other than Oldenberg’s and Geldner’s.

³ An objective genitive may also be present in line 7 of the same hymn: *kadā canā prá yuchasy ubhé ní pási jánmanī / túriyāditya hávanam ta indriyám á tasthāv amṣtam diví* “You never keep away, you protect both creations/races. O fourth Aditya, your immortal indra-related call has mounted up to heaven. / O fourth Aditya, the indra-related call is yours, the Amṛta has mounted up to heaven.” Whatever the exact interpretation of the second line (one or two sentences?), it seems clear that *te* belongs to *hávanam*, i.e. ‘your invocation/the invocation of you’.

⁴ Cf. also RV 1.4.10 *yó rāyó ’vánir mahān supārāḥ sunvatāḥ sákhā / tásmā indrāya gāyata*, RV 2.13.5 *ádbākṛṇoḥ pṛthivīm samāḥṣe divé yó dhautinām abihann árinak patbāḥ / tam tvā stómehbir udábbir ná vājīnam devám devá ajanan sāsya ukṭhyaḥ*

anacoluth: “in whose (i.e. the singer’s) songs you took delight // as such we call you ...”⁵

The relative pronoun might thus be taken as referring to a second person just as it is frequently the case with the demonstrative pronoun in the so-called “*sá figé*”-construction, which, according to Jamison, might have given the model for the *tam tvā* type found 69x in the RV⁶ and which is generally taken to be coreferential with the preceding relative pronoun.⁷

Daniel Kölligan

Universität zu Köln
 Institut für Linguistik -
 Abt. Historisch-Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft
 50923 Köln

⁵ Anacoluths, though, are not uncommon in the *Vāḷakhilya*-hymns, cf. in the same hymn v. 8 *yásmai tvám maghavann indra girvanāḥ śikṣo śikṣasi dāsūṣe / asmākam gtra utá suṣṭutīm vaso kanvavác chṛṇudbī hávam* “Which sacrificer you, o bounteous Indra, lover of songs, liberal/helpful one, favour, // hear our songs and praises, o good one, as a kanvalike incantation.”

⁶ Cf. Jamison (1992), Klein (1996), Watkins (2000). If one does not want to assume this, one has to acknowledge at least that the change from 3rd to 2nd person reference is common throughout the poem, cf. verses 5 in 3rd person (*yo no dātā sá naḥ pitā* “Who is our giver, he is our father.” [Not to be taken as obj. gen. ‘giving us away’, but as ‘giving (gifts) to us’.]) and 6 in 2nd person (*yásmai tvám vaso dānāya māmbase* “to whom you, o good one, give for giving”)

⁷ Cf. Watkins (2000: 271) who analyses the structure of these sentences as *yá-TVAM* [V], *tam tvā*.

Bibliography

- Arnold, E. V. (1905). *Vedic metre in its historical development*. Cambridge. (Repr. Delhi 1967).
- Delbrück, B. (1888). *Altindische Syntax*. Halle: Buchh. d. Waisenhauses.
- Jamison, S. (1992). Vedic "śá figé": An inherited sentence connective?, *HS* 105, 213-239.
- Klein, J. S. (1996). 'śá figé' and Indo-European Deixis, *HS* 109, 21-39.
- Oldenberg, H. (1909). *Rgveda. Textkritische und exegetische Noten*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Watkins, C. (2000). 'śá figé' in Indo-Iranian and Anatolian, in: A. Hintze, & E. Tichy (eds.), *Anusantatyai. Festschrift für Johanna Narten*. Dettelbach: Röhl. 263-281.

Notizen zu gallisch βρατου

von Karin Stüber

Die mehrmals auf Weihinschriften belegte gallische Form βρατου hat Anlass zu einer reichen Sekundärliteratur gegeben. Dennoch ist sich die Forschung bis heute über ihre Morphologie, Etymologie und Semantik nicht einig. Bezeichnend für die anhaltende Kontroverse ist, dass gall. βρατου in einem neueren Werk wie Matasović 2009 nur mit Fragezeichen zu urkelt. *brātu- gestellt wird (74). Im vorliegenden Beitrag sollen die bisher vorgebrachten Lösungsansätze diskutiert und zu einer schlüssigen Synthese zusammengefügt werden. Nach einem Überblick über die Belege werden daher die Aspekte der Morphologie, Etymologie und Semantik von gall. βρατου beleuchtet.

1. Belege

Gall. βρατου ist bisher ausschliesslich auf Weihinschriften aus dem südlichen Frankreich belegt, die alle im griechischen Alphabet verfasst sind. Die Texte wurden von Szemerényi (1974) zusammengestellt. Da aber für die Frage nach Morphologie und Semantik von βρατου auch Syntax und Kontext von Bedeutung sind, sei es erlaubt, sie hier nochmals kurz anzuführen.¹ Zählung und Lesungen folgen dabei Lejeune (RIG I). Vorauszuschicken ist, dass keine der Inschriften Worttrenner verwendet, sich andererseits einzelne Wörter oft über zwei oder gar mehr Zeilen erstrecken.

¹ Nicht aufgenommen wurde G-66 (Saint-Rémy), da der Inschriftenträger verloren und die Inschrift nur durch verschiedene handschriftliche Abzeichnungen des 17. Jahrhunderts auf uns gekommen ist. Diese überliefern übereinstimmend eine Lesung βρατου am Ende der Inschrift. Was davor stand, ist dagegen unsicher, ebenso, ob der Stein dahinter abgebrochen war. Der fehlende Kontext macht den Beleg für unsere Zwecke wertlos.