The Diachrony of Ditransitives in Vedic Sanskrit

Eystein Dahl, UiT – The Arctic University of Norway

1 Introduction

Indo-Iranian in general and Old Indo-Aryan in particular is usually regarded as a morphosyntactically rather conservative branch of the Indo-European linguistic family. However, recent work (e.g. Cotticelli and Dahl Forthcoming) demonstrates that Early Vedic, the oldest attested variety of Old Indo-Aryan, shows a number of important innovations in its alignment system, including the establishing of a more consistently nominative-accusative agreement on finite verbs *vis-à-vis* Indo-Iranian, as suggested by comparative data from Avestan. Moreover, previous works (e.g. Dahl 2009, 2014a, 2014b, Forthcoming, Cotticelli and Dahl Forthcoming) have established that while Old Indo-Aryan is rather permissive towards non-canonical object realization patterns, non-canonical subject constructions are rather scarce in the language. Based on these observations, the present paper examines the diachronic behaviour of the verbal arguments in ditransitive constructions in Vedic Sanskrit.

Vedic Sanskrit has a rich case system comprising no less than eight morphological case categories, seven of which are regularly or occasionally used in argument realization. In this language, ditransitive predicates like *dā-* 'give' or *vi-bhaj-* 'apportion', generally show the characteristic AGENT/NOM-THEME/ACC-RECEPIENT/DAT case frame known from other Indo-European languages.[1] Consider, by way of illustration, the examples in (1).

(1) a. *aháṃ* **bhū́mim** *adadām* **ā́ryāya**
    I:NOM land:ACC give:IPF.1SG Ārya:DAT

    aháṃ vṛṣṭíṃ *dāśúṣe* *mártyāya*
    I:NOM rain:ACC pious:DAT mortal:DAT

    'I gave land to the Ārya; I (gave) rain to the pious mortal' (Rigveda IV 26.2 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 600)[2]

 b. *aháṃ* **dāśúṣe** *ví* *bhajāmi* **bhójanam**
   I:NOM pious:DAT PRV apportion:PRS.1SG food:ACC

---

[1] Note that Vedic, like other archaic Indo-European languages is a pro-drop language and that the nominative-marked argument is frequently omitted.

[2] Cf. Geldner (1951a: 454): 'Ich gab das Land dem Arier, ich dem opfernden Sterblichen den Regen.'

'I apportion food to the pious man' (Rigveda X 48.1 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1455)[3]

These examples illustrate that ditransitive predicates regularly select a nominative-marked agent argument (*ahám*), an accusative-marked theme argument (*bhū́mim, vṛṣṭím, bhójanam*) and a dative-marked recepient argument (*ā́ryāya, dāśúṣe mártyāya, dāśúṣe*).

While this pattern seems to be the predominant way of encoding the arguments of ditransitive predicates in Vedic Sanskrit, it is not the only one available, as we shall see below. In the following, we address variation and change in the argument realization patterns of ditransitive predicates in Vedic Sanskrit. The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 outlines some philological and theoretical preliminaries. Section 3 gives an overview of the system of ditransitive constructions in Early Vedic (3.1), Middle Vedic (3.2) and Late Vedic (3.3). Section 4 discusses the consequences of the main observations made in the paper and Section 5 provides a brief conclusion.

2 Philological and theoretical preliminaries

Vedic Sanskrit is the oldest attested form of Indo-Aryan, a subbranch of the Indo-Iranian branch of the Indo-European linguistic family. It is the language of the so-called Vedas and their ancillary texts, the Brāhmaṇas, which together constitute the oldest extant sources of Indo-Aryan. Old Indo-Aryan also comprises Classical Sanskrit, which, however, falls outside the scope of the present paper.

The historical context of the Vedic sources remains opaque and it is therefore difficult to establish an absolute chronology. It is likely that the earliest text, the Rigveda, existed in its present form around 1200 BCE, parts of it originating from the first half of the second millennium BCE. The latest Vedic texts probably belong to the period just before 600 BCE. Our absolute chronological framework thus covers approximately 6 centuries, from ca. 1200 to 600 BCE. For present purposes, we distinguish three distinct chronological stages of Vedic, given in Table 1.[4]

Table 1. Chronological stages of Vedic

Early Vedic:	The language of the *Rigveda* (RV)

---

[3] Cf. Geldner (1951c: 206): 'Ich teile dem Opferspender Speisung aus.'

[4] Cf. Witzel (1989, 1995) for a more detailed chronology, and Kulikov (2013) for a somewhat different chronological framework.

Middle Vedic:	The language characterizing the oldest Vedic prose texts of the *Yajurveda*
Late Vedic	The language of the *Brāhmaṇas* and Early *Upaniṣads*

We noted in the introductory section that Vedic Sanskrit has a consistently nominative-accusative alignment system from the beginning of its attested tradition. In cross-linguistic perspective, nominative-accusative alignment is one of several possible ways of organizing the morphosyntax of argument realization. Typological studies (e.g. Comrie 1989, Dixon 1994) distinguish between the first argument of two-place verbs (A), the second argument of two-place verbs (P) and the sole argument of one-place verbs (S).[5] On this basis, a number of alignment types may be defined, as illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2. Some basic alignment types

Accusative	Ergative	Neutral	Tripartite	Double Oblique	Semantic
A=S≠P	A≠S=P	A=S=P	A≠S≠P	A=P≠S	A≠P, A = S_A, P = S_P

The observation that Vedic Sanskrit has predominantly nominative-accusative alignment finds support in data from Early Vedic like those cited in (2).

(2)   a.   *índro*   *yád*   *vṛtrám*   *ávadhīn*   *nadīvṛ́tam*

            Indra:NOM   when   Vṛtra:ACC   smash:AOR.3SG   obstructing.the.rivers:ACC

            'When Indra smashed Vṛtra, who obstructed the rivers' (Rigveda I 52.2)[6]

        b.   *índro*   *mádāya*   *vāvṛdhe*

            Indra:NOM   exhilaration:DAT   strengthen:PRF.MID.3SG

            'Indra has been strengthened for exhilaration' (Rigveda I 81.1 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 206)[7]

        c.   *yá*   *imé*   *ródasī*   *ubhé*

            rel:NOM.SG   these:ACC.DU   world.halves:ACC   both:ACC

            ahám   *índram*   *átuṣṭavam*

            I:NOM   Indra:ACC   praise:PPF.1SG

---

[5] Note that we follow Comrie (1989) in using the symbol P instead of Dixon's (1994) O to denote the second argument of two-place predicates.

[6] Cf. Jamison and Brereton (2014: 52): 'he smashed Vṛtra, who obstructed the rivers.' Geldner (1951a: 65) translates 'da er den Flußsperrer Vṛtra erschlug.'

[7] Cf. Geldner (1952a: 104): 'Indra, den Vṛtratöter, ward (…) zum Rausch (…) gestärkt.'

'I who have praised both these two world-halves here and Indra' (Rigveda III 53.12 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 539)[8]

These examples illustrate that the proper noun *Indra* has the same (nominative) form (*índro*) in A and S function, and a different (accusative) form (*índram*) in P function. For the sake of completeness, it should be noted that most, but not all, nouns and pronouns have distinct forms for nominative and accusative, neuter nouns, however, having syncretic forms for these two case categories.

Ditransitive predicates, on the other hand, feature a first argument (A), a theme argument (T) and a recipient argument (R) (cf. Malchukov, Haspelmath and Comrie 2010, Malchukov 2014). Languages differ with regard to the expression of T and R, and Malchukov, Haspelmath and Comrie (2010: 3-5) note that three ditransitive alignment types may be distinguished: *indirective*, where T has the same coding as P and R has a different coding, *secundative*, where R has the same coding as P and T has a different coding, and *neutral*, where T, R and P have the same coding. On the other hand, tripartite alignment describes a situation where T, R and P each have a different coding and horizontal alignment a situation where T and R have the same coding and P another coding. Table 2 gives a schematic representation of these types.[9]

Table 2. Ditransitive alignment types

Indirective	Secundative	Neutral	Tripartite	Horizontal
T=P≠R	T≠P=R	T=P=R	T≠P≠R	T=R≠P

Malchukov, Haspelmath and Comrie (2010: 2) note that 'All languages have far fewer ditransitive verbs than transitive verbs, and the ditransitive verbs of a language do not necessarily behave uniformly. While all languages have a substantial class of transitive verbs (at least several dozen) that behave uniformly, some languages only have a handful of ditransitive verbs, and not uncommonly these do not behave alike. Thus, we will not assume that there is necessarily a single major ditransitive construction in a language.' As noted in the introduction, Early Vedic ditransitive predicates tend to select an accusative-marked T argument and a dative-marked R argument, as shown by the examples in (1) above and (3a)

---

[8] Cf. Geldner (1952a: 394): 'Der ich diese beiden Welten, der ich den Indra gepriesen habe.'

[9] According to Malchukov, Haspelmath and Comrie (2010: 6) tripartite and horizontal alignment are extremely rare across languages, both representing uneconomical patterns.

below. However, we also find secundative and neutral patterns, as illustrated by the Early Vedic examples in (3b) and (3c), respectively.

(3)   a.   *áhobhir*   *adbhír*   *aktúbhir*   **vyàktaṃ**

          day:INS.PL   water:INS.PL   night:INS.PL   anointed:ACC

          yamó   *dadāty*   **avasā́nam**   **asmai**

          Yama:NOM   give:PRS.3SG   resting.place:ACC   he:DAT

          'A resting place anointed with waters through the days and nights Yama gives to him' (Rigveda X 14.9 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1392)[10]

    b.   *ṛtásya*   **bhāgé**   **yájamānam**   *ā́bhajat*

          truth:GEN   portion:LOC   sacrificer:ACC   apportion:IPF.3SG

          'He apportioned to the sacrificer a portion of truth' (Rigveda I 156.5 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 334)[11]

    c.   *agnáye*   *bráhma*   *ṛbhávas*   *tatakṣur*

          Agni:DAT   formulation:ACC   Ṛbhus:NOM.PL   fashion:PRF.3PL

          agníṃ   **mahā́m**   *avocāmā*   **suvṛktím**

          Agni:ACC   great:ACC   speak:AOR.1PL   well.turned:ACC

          'For Agni did the Ṛbhus fashion their formulation; to Agni have we spoken a great, well-turned (hymn)' (Rigveda X 80.7 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1513)[12]

As we shall discuss in somewhat more detail in the following section, the secundative and neutral patterns instantiated in (3b) and (3c) show a more restricted distribution than the indirective pattern illustrated in (1) and (3a).

An important question arising from the above observations is to what extent a system of ditransitive constructions with several lexically distributed constructions remains stable over time. Given that we find no less than three patterns of encoding ditransitive situations in Early Vedic, as illustrated by the examples in (1) and (3), it would hardly be surprising if such variation gave way to a more unitary alignment system via extension/analogical change. In the

---

[10] Cf. Geldner (1952c: 144): 'Einen durch Tage, Wasser, Nächte verschönten Rastort gewähret Yama diesem.'

[11] Cf. Geldner (1952a: 215): 'Er gab dem Opfernden Anteil an dem Genuß des Gesetzes.'

[12] Cf. Geldner (1952c: 262): 'Für Agni hat die Ṛbhu's eine erbauliche Rede gezimmert, zu Agni haben wir ein großes Loblied gesprochen.'

following section, we examine data from the three chronological stages of Vedic in order to establish whether it is possible to identify any changes in this realm of grammar.

3 Ditransitive alignment in Vedic Sanskrit

3.1 Early Vedic

In the previous section, we have seen that Early Vedic employs three distinct types of ditransitive construction, an indirective (T=P≠R), a secundative (T≠P=R) and a neutral type (T=P=R). Moreover, it was noted that the indirective construction appears to be the predominant one, the two others being subject to more or less strict lexical constraints, without specifying further the nature of these distributional constraints and to what extent they are exclusive or overlap to some extent. Thus, a first task of the present section is to delineate the relationship between the three ditransitive constructions identified in Early Vedic.

Starting with the secundative construction with a locative-marked T-argument and an accusative-marked R argument, we note that it seems to appear exclusively with the compound verb *ā́-bhaj-* 'apportion, give a share in' consisting of the the preverbal particle *ā́* and the simplex verb *bhaj-* 'apportion', which never selects this construction type. On the other hand, the compound verb *ā́-bhaj-* exclusively selects this particular secundative construction in Early Vedic, as illustrated also by the examples in (4).[13]

(4) a. *yā́m̐*   *ā́bhajo*   *marúta*   *indra*   *sóme*
        REL:ACC.PL   apportion:IPF.3SG   marut:ACC.PL   Indra:VOC   soma:LOC

        yé   *tvā́m*   *ávardhann*   *ábhavan*   *gaṇás*   *te*
        REL:NOM.PL you:ACC   strengthen:IPF.3PL become:IPF.3PL flock:NOM you:GEN

        'The Maruts, to whom you, Indra, gave a share in soma, who strengthened you and became your flock' (Rigveda III 35.9, cf. Jamison and Brereton 2014: 518)[14]

    b. *ā́*   *no*   *bhajasva*   *rā́dhasi*
        PRV   we:ACC apportion:PRS.IMP.MID.2SG   largesse:LOC

        'Give us a share in your largesse' (Rigveda IV 32.21 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 609)[15]

---

[13] The verb *Ā́-BHAJ-* 'apportion' is attested 24 times in the Rigveda.

[14] Cf. Geldner (1952a: 376): 'Die Marut, die du am Soma teilnehmen ließest, o Indra, die dich stärkten und dein Gefolge wurden.'

[15] Cf. Geldner (1952a: 462): 'Gib uns Anteil und deiner Gabe.'

Example (4b) is particularly intriguing in the present context, since it clearly shows that the verbal compound does not (yet) constitute a fully lexicalized unit but allows enclitic elements like the pronoun *nas* 'us' to appear *in tmesi*. Taken together, these considerations clearly show that the compound verb *ā́-bhaj-* is a semantically unitary lexical unit selecting an idiosyncratic case frame in argument realization.[16]

Turning now to the neutral construction, we first note that it is most readily observable with *verba dicendi* like *vac-* 'speak', *praś-* 'ask' or *yāc-* 'ask, entreat', as illustrated in (3c) above, repeated here as (5a) for convenience, (5b) and (5c).

(5)   a.   *agnáye*   *bráhma*   *r̥bhávas*   *tatakṣur*

             Agni:DAT   formulation:ACC   R̥bhus:NOM.PL fashion:PRF.3PL

             agním   ***mahā́m***   *avocāmā*   ***suvr̥ktím***

             Agni:ACC   great:ACC   speak:AOR.1PL   well.turned:ACC

             'For Agni did the R̥bhus fashion their formulation; to Agni have we spoken a great, well-turned (hymn)' (Rigveda X 80.7 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1513)[17]

      b.   ***pr̥cchā́mi***   ***tvā***   ***páram***   ***ántaṃ***   *pr̥thivyā́ḥ*

             ask:PRS.1SG   you:ACC   farthest:ACC   end:ACC   earth:GEN

             'I ask thee about the farthest end of the earth' (Rigveda I 164.34 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 358)[18]

      c.   *yā́cante*   ***sumnáṃ***   ***pávamānam***   ***ákṣitam***

             beg:PRS.3PL   grace:ACC   self.purifying:ACC   imperishable:ACC

             'They beg the imperishable self-purifying one for his grace' (Rigveda IX 78.3 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1312)[19]

These examples illustrate that the neutral ditransitive pattern exclusively appears with the *verba dicendi vac-* 'speak', *praś-* 'ask' and *yāc-* 'ask, entreat' in Early Vedic, seemingly reflecting a lexically restricted alignment pattern. Unlike the case discussed earlier, however, the two former verbs appear rather infrequently in this construction, the two examples cited in (5a) and

---

[16] It is likely that this peculiar argument realization pattern somehow reflects that the preverb *ā́* also functions as an adposition which may govern the accusative, ablative or locative. A full evaluation of the implications rising from this observation is far beyond the scope of the present paper and will have to be undertaken elsewhere.

[17] Cf. Geldner (1952c: 262): 'Für Agni hat die R̥bhu's eine erbauliche Rede gezimmert, zu Agni haben wir ein großes Loblied gesprochen.'

[18] Cf. Geldner (1952a: 234): ‚Ich frage dich nach der äußersten Grenze der Erde.'

[19] Cf. Geldner (1952c: 72): 'Sie bitten den Pavamāna um unverminderte Gunst.'

(5b) representing *hapax legomena* in the Rigvedic corpus.[20] On the other hand, *yāc-* 'ask, entreat' shows a slightly less scanty tendency to select this argument realization pattern.[21] As we shall see shortly, however, *vac-* also appears in the indirective pattern, unlike the other two other verbs.

We stated in the introduction without any further justification that the indirective pattern represents the predominant argument realization option for ditransitive predicates in Early Vedic. In the following, this claim will be substantiated. First, verbs of physical transfer like *dā-* and *vi-bhaj-*, – prototypically ditransitive verbs, as it were – characteristically select the indirective pattern, as illustrated by the examples in (1) above and (6).

(6) a. **ugrā́ya**   **te**   **sáho**   **bálaṃ**   *dadāmi*
         mighty:DAT   you:DAT   power:ACC   strength:ACC give:PRS.1SG
         'I give power and strength to you who are mighty' (Rigveda X 116.5 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1585)[22]

     b. *sám*   *īṃ*   *paṇér*   *ajati*   *bhójanaṃ*   *muṣé*
         PRV   PTC   niggard:GEN drive:PRS.3SG sustenance:ACC steal:INF

         ví   **dāśúṣe**   *bhajati*   *sūnáraṃ*   *vásu*
         PRV   pious:DAT   apportion:PRS.3SG   liberal:ACC   goods:ACC
         'He drives together the sustenance of the niggard, to steal it, but he shares out liberal goods to the pious' (Rigveda V 34.7 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 701)[23]

Second, certain ditransitive verbs denoting a speech act show an alternation between the neutral construction, illustrated in (5) and the indirective construction, as illustrated in (7).

(7) a. **imā́ṃ**   **pratnā́ya**   **suṣṭutíṃ**   **návīyasīṃ**
         this:ACC   ancient:DAT   good.praise:ACC   newer:ACC

         vocéyam   **asmā**   **uśaté**   *śṛṇótu*   *naḥ*
         proclaim:AOR.OPT.1SG   he:DAT   eager:DAT   hear:PRS.IMP.3SG   we:GEN

---

[20] The simplex verb *vac-* 'speak' is attested 59 times in the Rigvedic corpus, 11 times in ditransitive function. The verb *praś-* 'ask', on the other hand, is attested 21 times, and only once in ditransitive function.

[21] The verb *yāc-* 'ask, entreat' is attested nine times in the Rigveda, six of which instantiate the neutral ditransitive pattern and three of which instantiate transitive rather than intransitive uses of the verb.

[22] Cf. Geldner (1952c: 341): 'Ich gebe dir, dem Gewaltigen, Überlegenheit und Kraft.'

[23] Cf. Geldner (1952b: 34): 'Er treibt den Wohlstand des Geizigen zusammen, um ihn zu rauben, und teilt dem Opferwilligen herrliches Gut zu.'

'I would proclaim this good praise here, a newer one, to him, the age-old, who is eager for it: let him hear us.' (Rigveda X 91.13 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1541)[24]

    b.   **imā́**   **bráhma**   *bṛháddivo*   *vivakti*

these:ACC   sacred.formulation:ACC.PL   Bṛhaddiva:NOM speak:PRS.3SG

índrāya   *śūṣám*

Indra:DAT   loud:ACC

'Bṛhaddiva speaks these sacred formulations fortissimo to Indra' (Rigveda X 120.8 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1592)[25]

Note that these examples do not seem to show any significant difference in meaning when compared with the pertinent example in (5a).

    Third, certain change of location verbs likewise show alternation between a construction involving an accusative-marked theme argument and a locative-marked NP denoting location, and the indirective construction, where the indirective construction appears to imply a change in meaning. Consider, by way of illustration, the examples in (8).

(8)   a.   *índum*   *índre*   *dadhātana*

drop:ACC   Indra:LOC   place:PRS.IMP.2PL

'Place the drop in Indra.' (Rigveda IX 11.6 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1247)[26]

    b.   *sá*   *vājínaṃ*   *maghávadbhyo*   *dadhāti*

he:NOM   prizewinner:ACC   benefactor:DAT.PL   place:PRS.3SG

'He provides a prizewinner to the benefactors.' (Rigveda VII 95.3 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1003)[27]

These examples illustrate that the verb *dhā-* 'place, put' characteristically occur with an accusative-marked theme and a locative-marked location argument, as in (8a), but that it is compatible with the indirective construction, yielding a clearly ditransitive meaning, as in (8b).

---

[24] Cf. Geldner (1952c: 290): 'Dieses neueste Loblied will ich dem Uralten aufsagen, ihm, der darnach verlangt, er höre auf uns.'

[25] Cf. Geldner (1952c: 347): 'Diese erbaulichen Reden spricht Bṛhaddiva als Aufmunterung für Indra.'

[26] Cf. Geldner (1952c: 18): 'Bringet den Saft in Indra!'

[27] cf. Geldner (1952b: 265): 'Er verschafft den Gönnern ein Siegesroß.'

The assumption that the indirective pattern is predominant in Early Vedic finds support in two further types of evidence, antipassivization and passivization, both of which arguably follow an indirective pattern in Early Vedic. Note that the assumption that Early Vedic has both of these constructions is not without controversy; however, in the following a case will be made for the claim that Early Vedic has both antipassive-like and passive-like constructions, both of which follow an indirective pattern.

So far, we have encountered cases where the indirective ditransitive construction has an accusative-marked theme argument. However, on occasion ditransitive verbs appear with a theme argument in the genitive, as illustrated in (9).

(9)   a.   *ápa*   ***te***   ***gávām̐***   *subhage*   *bhajāma*

           PRV   you:DAT   cow:GEN.PL   fortunate:VOC   portion:PRS.SBJ.1PL

           'We will give away a portion of the cows to you, fortunate one.' (Rigveda X 108.9 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1573)[28]

   b.   *puraṃdaráḥ*   *papivā́m̐*   *índro*   *asya*

           stronghold.splitting:NOM   drink:PRF.PTC.NOM   Indra:NOM   it:GEN

           púnar   ***gávām***   *adadād*   ***usríyāṇām***

           again   cow:GEN.PL   give:IPF.3SG   ruddy:GEN.PL

           'The stronghold-splitting Indra, having drunk of it, gave again of the ruddy cows' (Rigveda V 30.11 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 694)[29]

Example (9a) illustrates that the verb *apa-bhaj-* 'give away' may select a genitive-marked theme argument (*gávām usríyāṇām*) in addition to the dative-marked recipient argument (*te*). Example (9b) shows that the verb *dā-* 'give' likewise is compatible with genitive-marked theme arguments (*gávām usríyāṇām*) with no expressed recipient argument. As discussed elsewhere (e.g. Dahl 2009), several verb types show alternation between accusative and genitive in argument realization. Consider, for instance, the examples in (10).

(10)   a.   *áśvinā*   *mádhumattamaṃ*

           Aśvin:VOC.DU   most.honey.filled:ACC

           pātā́m̐   *sómam*   *ṛtāvṛdhā*

           drink:AOR.IMP.2DU   soma:ACC   strong.through.truth:VOC.DU

---

[28] Cf. Geldner (1952c: 330): 'Wir wollen dir, Holde, von den Kühen welche abgeben.'

[29] Cf. Geldner (1952b: 28): 'Nachdem der Burgenbrecher Indra davon getrunken hatte, geb er von den rötlichen Kühen welche zurück.'

'O Aśvins, growing strong through truth, drink the most honey-filled soma.'
(Rigveda I 47.3 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 159)[30]

b. *kuvít   sómasya   ápām   íti*
    PTC   soma:GEN   drink:AOR.1SG PTC
    'Have I drunk of the soma? Yes!' (Rigvèda X 119.1 after Jamison and Brereton
    2014: 1590)[31]

In these and similar cases, the P argument alternately may select the default accusative case, as
in (10a) or the genitive case, as in (10b). Drawing on the discussion in Dahl (2009), we observe
that genitive-marked NPs in P function characteristically express a lower degree of affectedness
of the P argument, thus having a valency-reducing effect, and it is reasonable to regard this
construction type as an antipassive construction, where the theme argument receives oblique
case marking. Cases like those illustrated in (9) lend themselves easily to an analysis along
similar lines, allowing us to conclude that the antipassive construction follow an indirective
pattern in Early Vedic, treating P and T alike.

Turning now to passivization, Early Vedic has at least three constructions which have
traditionally been labelled 'passive', the present passive, the so-called aorist passive and the so-
called past passive participle in *-tá*. The behaviour of each of these constructions will be
assessed in turn.

Before turning to the data, it should be noted that present passive forms of ditransitive
predicates are extremely rare in Early Vedic. In fact, I was only able to identify one such form,
the present participle form *upadadyámāne* 'offered' in (11a), which targets the T argument of
the underlying verb *upa-dā-* 'offer'. Example (11b) shows that present passive participle forms
of monotransitive predicates like *goh-* 'hide' target the P argument.

(11) a. *tásya*   *te*   **śármann**   **upadadyámāne**
          this:GEN   you:GEN   shelter:LOC   offer:PRS.PASS.PTC.LOC

          rāyā́   *madema*   *tanvà̀*   *tánā*   *ca*
          wealth:INS   rejoice:PRS.OPT.1PL life:INS   offspring:INS   and
          'In this shelter of yours (still) being offered might we rejoice with wealth, with
          life and lineage.' (Rigveda VI 49.13 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 843)[32]

[30] Cf. Geldner (1952a: 58): 'Trinket den süßesten Soma, ihr Wahrheitsmehrer Aśvin.'

[31] Cf. Geldner (1952c: 345): 'Ich merke, daß ich Soma getrunken habe.'

[32] Cf. Geldner (1952b: 151): '(…) wollen wir in deiner dargebotenen Zuflucht am Reichtum uns ergötzen, wir
selbst mit den Kindern.'

<table>
<tr><td>b.</td><td colspan="3">*trídhā hitáṃ*</td><td colspan="2">*paṇíbhir*</td><td colspan="2">**guhyámānaṃ**</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="3">triply deposit:PPP.ACC</td><td colspan="2">niggard:INS.PL</td><td colspan="2">hide:PRS.PASS.PTC.ACC</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>*gávi*</td><td colspan="2">*devā́so*</td><td>**ghr̥tám**</td><td>*ánv*</td><td>*avindan*</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>cow:LOC</td><td colspan="2">god:NOM.PL</td><td>ghee:ACC</td><td>PRV</td><td>find:IPF.3SG</td></tr>
</table>

'Triply deposited, being hidden by the niggards—the gods discovered the ghee in the cow.' (Rigveda IV 58.4 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 644)[33]

Although admittedly somewhat scanty, these data indicate that the present passive operates on a P/T basis, reflecting an indirective alignment pattern.

Turning now to the so-called aorist passive, we first note that this construction type is compatible with ditransitive, monotransitive and some intransitive predicates. The fact that it occasionally combines with intransitive predicates essentially precludes a passive analysis *sensu stricto* and rather indicates that it represents a P-oriented resultative construction. From the perspective of the present paper, it is important to note that aorist passive forms of ditransitive verbs like *dāyi* from *dā-* 'give' target T (12a), while analogous forms of monotransitive predicates such as *apāyi* from *pā-* 'drink' target P (12b). For the sake of completeness, example (12c) illustrates that so-called passive aorist forms of intransitive predicates are restricted to unaccusative verbs, as shown by the form *agāmi* from *gam-* 'come, go', which may be taken to have a P-like S argument.

<table>
<tr><td>(12)</td><td>a.</td><td>*tásmai*</td><td>**tavasyàm**</td><td>**ánu**</td><td>**dāyi**</td><td>*satrā́*</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>this:DAT</td><td>strength:NOM</td><td>PRV</td><td>give:AOR.PASS.3SG</td><td>altogether</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>*índrāya*</td><td>*devébhir*</td><td>*árṇasātau*</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Indra:DAT</td><td>gods:INS.PL</td><td>water.conquest:LOC</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

'In every way might was conceded by the gods to him, to Indra, at the winning of the flood.' (Rigveda II 20.8 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 181)[34]

<table>
<tr><td>b.</td><td>*índrasya*</td><td>**priyám**</td><td>**amŕ̥tam**</td><td>**apāyi**</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Indra:GEN</td><td>dear:NOM</td><td>immortal:NOM</td><td>drink:AOR.PASS.3SG</td></tr>
</table>

'Indra's dear immortal (drink) has been drunk' (Rigveda VI 44.16 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 828)[35]

---

[33] Cf. Geldner (1952a: 489): 'Dreifach geteilt fanden das von den Paṇi's verborgene Ghr̥ta die Götter wieder in der Kuh.'

[34] Cf. Geldner (1952a: 301): 'Diesem Indra ward von den Göttern im Kampf um das Wasser ganz und gar die Überlegenheit zugestanden.'

[35] Cf. Geldner (1952b: 139): 'Indra hat seinen lieben Göttertrank getrunken.'

c.   *ā́*   *agnír*   *agāmi*   *bhā́rato*   *vṛtrahā́*

  PRV   Agni:NOM come:AOR.PASS.3SG of.Bharatas:NOM obstacle.smasher:NOM

  purucétanaḥ   *dívodāsasya*   *sátpatiḥ*

  manifest.to.many:NOM   Divodāsa:GEN lord.NOM

  'Agni has come here, the one belonging to the Bharatas, obstacle-smasher, manifest to many, lord of the settlements of Divodāsa.' (Rigveda VI 16.19 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 792)[36]

Thus, we observe that the so-called aorist passive instantiates an indirective alignment pattern, just like the antipassive construction and the present passive, illustrated in examples (9) and (11) above.

As regards the so-called past passive participle (PPP) in *-tá* it shows a similar distribution as the passive aorist, in that it combines with ditransitive, monotransitive and certain intransitive predicates, as illustrated by the examples in (13).

(13) a.   *úpa*   *mā*   **śyā́vā́ḥ**   *svanáyena*   **dattā́**

   PRV   I:ACC   dusky:NOM.PL   Svanaya:INS   give:PPP.NOM.PL

   vadhū̆manto   *dáśa*   *ráthāso*   *asthuḥ*

   bride.containing:NOM.PL   ten   chariot:NOM.PL   stand:AOR.3PL

   'The dusky (horses) given by Svanaya have come to me, and ten chariots carrying brides.' (Rigveda I 126.3 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 291)[37]

b.   **hatā́**   *índreṇa*   **paṇayaḥ**   *śayadhve*

   smash:PPP.NOM   Indra:INS   Paṇi:VOC.PL   lie:PRS.2PL

   'Smashed by Indra, Paṇis, you will lie still.' (Rigveda X 108.4 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1573)[38]

c.   *kvà*   **ṛtáṃ**   **pūrvyáṃ**   **gatáṃ**

   where   truth:NOM   earlier:NOM   come:PPP.NOM

   'Where has my earlier "truth" gone?' (Rigveda I 105.4 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 251)[39]

---

[36] Cf. Geldner (1952b: 110): 'Agni, der Bharatide, ward jetzt angegangen, der vielbekannte Vṛtratöter, der wahre gebieter des Divodāsa.'

[37] Cf. Geldner (1952a: 175); 'Die Rappen, die Svanaya geschenkt, zehn Wagen samt Frauen sind auf mich zugekommen.'

[38] Cf. Geldner (1952c: 329): 'Von Indra erschlagen sollt ihr Paṇi's daliegen.'

[39] Cf. Geldner (1952a: 137): 'Wohin ist mein früheres rechtes (Werk) gekommen?'

Example (13a) illustrates that PPP forms of ditransitive predicates like *dattā́* from *dā-* 'give' targets the T argument, which is treated in the same manner as P arguments in the case of PPP forms like *hatā́* from monotransitive predicates like *han-* 'smash' in (13b). Example (13c) illustrates that the PPP may also combine with intransitive predicates, as illustrated by the form *gatám* from *gam-* 'come, go'. Thus, just like the other valency-reducing constructions discussed above, the PPP instantiates an indirective alignment pattern.

Before concluding this section, a brief note may be added on middle forms of ditransitive predicates. The examples in (14) suffice to illustrate.

(14) a. *hiraṇyadā́*   *amṛtatváṃ*   *bhajante*
          gold.giver:NOM.PL   immortality:ACC   apportion:PRS.MID.3PL

          vāsodā́ḥ   *soma*   *prá tiranta*   *ā́yuḥ*
          garment.giver:NOM.PL Soma:VOC   PRV extend:PRS.MID.3PL life:ACC

          'Those giving gold receive a share in immortality; those giving garments extend their own lifetime, o Soma' (Rigveda X 107.2 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1571)[40]

      b. *tváyā* *vayáṁ* *suvṛ́dhā*   *brahmaṇas*   *pate*
          you:INS we:NOM growing.strong:INS sacred.formulation:GEN lord:VOC

          spārhā́   *vásu*   *manuṣyā́*
          eagerly.sought:ACC.PL good:ACC.PL of.Manu's.sons:ACC.PL

          dadīmahi
          give:PRS.OPT.MID.1PL

          'Through you growing very strong, o lord of the sacred formulation, we would receive the eagerly sought goods belonging to the sons of Manu' (Rigveda II 23.9 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 434)[41]

      c. *ví*   *bhajā*   *bhū́ri*   *te*   *vásu*
          PRV   apportion:PRS.IMP.2SG many:ACC you:GEN good:ACC.PL

          bhakṣīyá   *táva*   *rā́dhasaḥ*
          apportion:AOR.OPT.MID.1SG you:GEN generosity:GEN

---

[40] Cf. Geldner (1952c: 327): 'Die Goldschenker warden der Unsterblichkeit teilhaft, die Kleidschenker verlängern ihr Leben, o Soma.'

[41] Cf. Geldner (1952a: 304): 'Durch dich, den Wohlgedeilichen, möchten wir die begehrten menschlichen Güter empfangen, o Brahmaṇaspati.'

'Share out your many goods: might I have a share of your generosity' (Rigveda I 81.6 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 209)[42]

These examples illustrate that middle forms of the verbs *dā-* and *bhaj-* show R-oriented anticausative meaning in Vedic and that they may alternately select accusative and genitive marking of their theme argument, just like the active forms of these verbs.

At this point, a brief summary of the main points in this section is in order. We have seen that Early Vedic employs three alignment patterns with ditransitives, an indirective construction, a secundative construction and a neutral construction. The secundative construction involves a locative-marked T argument and an accusative-marked R argument and is restricted to one verb, *ā-bhaj-* 'apportion'. The neutral construction only appears with speech act verbs like *vac-* 'speak', *praś-* 'ask' or *yāc-* 'ask, entreat', some of which show alternation with the indirective construction. Finally, the indirective construction seemingly represents the default ditransitive pattern in Early Vedic, as reflected by the fact that it is the only pattern appearing with prototypical ditransitive verbs like *dā-* 'give' or *vi-bhaj-* 'apportion', that it extends to other, less prototypically ditransitive verbs like *dhā-* 'place, put' and that valency-reducing operations are oriented towards the T argument rather than the P argument. In the next section, we briefly review pertinent data from Middle Vedic.

3.2 Middle Vedic

The data in this section have been drawn from the prose portions of the Taittirīya Saṃhitā (TS), which is representative for Middle Vedic. First, we may note that the general picture emerging from this source is that the indirective construction is the default ditransitive construction, just as in Early Vedic, as illustrated by the examples in (15).

(15) a. *prajā́pates* *tráyastriṃśad duhitára* *āsan*
          Prajāpati:GEN thirtythree daughter:NOM.PL be:IPF.3PL

          tā́ḥ ***sómāya*** ***rā́jñe*** *'dadāt*
          they:ACC soma:DAT king:DAT give:IPF.3SG

          'Prajāpati had thirty-three daughters; he gave them to Soma, the king;' (TS II 3.5.1 after Keith 1914: 168)

      b. *mánuḥ* ***putrébhyo*** ***dāyáṃ*** *vy* *àbhajat*
          Manu:NOM son:DAT.PL share:ACC PRV apportion:IPF.3SG

          'Manu divided his property among his sons' (TS III 1.9.4 after Keith 1914: 232)

---

[42] Cf. Geldner (1952a: 104): 'Teil aus; dein ist viel Gut! Ich möchte deiner Gabe teilhaftig werden.'

15

c. *tásmā etám manthínaḥ saṁsrāvám ajuhot*

he:DAT the:ACC mixed:GEN remnant:ACC libate:IPF.3SG

'He poured out for him the remnants of the mixed (Soma)' (TS III 1.9.6 after Keith 1914: 233)

Furthermore, we may note that the verb *ā-bhaj-* selects the secundative construction identified in the previous section, with an accusative-marked R argument and a locative-marked T argument, as illustrated in (16).

(16) ***yajñé mā ā́ bhaja***

sacrifice:LOC I:ACC PRV apportion:PRS.IMP.2SG

atha te paśū́n ná abhí maṁsye

and you:GEN cattle:ACC.PL not PRV be.insidious:PRS.1SG

'Give me a share in the sacrifice, and I will not have designs against your cattle' (TS III 1.9.6 after Keith 1914: 233)

On the other hand, change of location verbs like *dhā-* 'place, put', which primarily select an accusative-locative case frame, is also marginally compatible with the indirective construction. Consider the examples in (17).

(17) a. *devā́ vái mṛtyór abibhayus té prajā́patim*

god:NOM.PL PTC death:ABL fear:IPF.3PL THEY:NOM Prajāpati:ACC

úpādhāvan tébhya etā́m prājāpatyā́ṁ śatákṛṣṇalāṁ

approach: IPF.3PL they:DAT this:ACC of.Prajāpati:ACC of.hundred.kṛṣṇalas:acc

*nír avapat táyā evá eṣv amṛ́tam **adadhāt***

PRV offer:IPF.3SG this:INS PTC they:LOC immortality:ACC place:IPF.3SG

'The gods were afraid of death; they had recourse to Prajāpati; for them he offered this (offering) to Prajāpati; by it he bestowed upon them immortality' (TS II 3.2.1 after Keith 1914: 165)

b. *tásmād eṣá vāmanáḥ sámīṣitaḥ **paśúbhya** evá*

therefore this:NOM dwarf:NOM stretched:NOM cattle:DAT.PL PTC

***prájātebhyaḥ pratiṣṭhā́ṁ** dadhāti*

born:DAT.PL support:ACC place:PRS.3SG

'Therefore the dwarf, stretched out, affords support to the cattle when born' (TS II 1.5.2)

In the previous section we also noted that some *verba dicendi* select a neutral pattern in their ditransitive use, under which both T and R receive accusative case. In Middle Vedic, however,

such verbs do not seem to show the neutral pattern but only appear in the indirective pattern, as illustrated by the examples in (18).

(18) a. **brā́hmaṇaṃ te**   *vakṣyāmi*   *yáthā*   *tvátpurohitā́ḥ*
            holy.lore:ACC you:DAT say:FUT.1SG that   you.Purohita:NOM.PL
            prajā́ḥ   *prajaniṣyánté*
            people:NOM.PL propagate:PRS.PASS.3PL
            'Holy lore shall I proclaim to you so that people will be propagated with you as Purohita' (TS III 5.2.1 after Keith 1914: 279)

       b. *sá*   *pratyákṣaṃ* **devébhyo**   **bhāgám**   *avadat*
            he:NOM openly   god:DAT.PL   share:ACC   speak:IPF.3SG
            paró'kṣam   **ásurebhyaḥ**
            secretly   Asura:DAT.PL
            'He promised openly the share to the gods, secretly to the Asuras' (TS II 5.1.1 after Keith 1914: 188)

The fact that verbs of this type do not show alternating argument realization patterns when used ditransitively may be taken to suggest that the indirective pattern has replaced the neutral ditransitive alignment pattern with *verba dicendi* at this stage.

The data presented here suggest that the behaviour of ditransitive predicates in Middle Vedic is largely similar to that found in Early Vedic, except for the occurrence of a neutral pattern with certain speech act verbs, which is unattested in Middle Vedic. In the next section, we assess the behaviour of ditransitives in Late Vedic.

3.3 Late Vedic

The data in this section are drawn from the Late Vedic texts *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* (JB) and *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (ŚBM), with sporadic examples from other Late Vedic texts. Again, we note that the indirective pattern is the default argument realization option for ditransitive predicates like *dā-* 'give' and *vi-bhaj-* 'apportion', as illustrated by the examples in (19).

(19) a. *eṣa*   *eva* *me* *varo*   *aham eva*   **yuṣmabhyaṃ** *pṛthak*
            this:NOM PTC I:GEN choice:NOM   I:NOM PTC   you:DAT.PL   separately
            pañca **sahasrāṇi**   **śatāśvāni**   *dadāni*
            five   thousand:ACC.PL   hundred.horses:ACC.PL give:PRS.SBJ.1SG
            'This is my choice: Let me give you separately (i.e. each of you) thousand (cows) and five hundred horses' (JB I 25 after Bodewitz 1973: 74)

b. *prajāpatiḥ* **prajābhya** **ūrjaṃ** *vyabhajat*

Prajāpati:NOM   creature:DAT.PL   strength:ACC   apportion:IPF.3SG

'Prajāpati distributed his strength for the creatures' (JB I 70 after Bodewitz 1990: 39)

As in previous stages of the language, the indirective pattern also extends to change of location verbs like *dhā-* 'place', which show the by now familiar alternation between the accusative-locative pattern and the accusative-dative pattern, the latter being associated with the transfer of possession meaning characteristic of ditransitive predicates. Consider the examples in (21a) and (21b).

(21) a. **prāṇān** *eva* *etat* **paśuṣu** *dadhāti*

breath:ACC.PL PTC   PTC   cattle:LOC.PL place:PRS.3SG

'Thereby he puts breath in the cattle' (JB I 140 after Bodewitz 1990: 79)

b. *hiṃkāreṇa* *vai* *jyotiṣā* *devās* **trivṛte**

him.exclamation:INS PTC   light:INS   god:NOM.PL   Trivṛt:DAT

brahmavarcasāya **jyotir** *adadhuḥ*

sacred:DAT   light:ACC   place:IPF.3PL

'With light in the form of the exclamation *him* the gods gave light to the sacred Trivṛt (Stoma)' (JB I 66, cf. Bodewitz 1990: 37)

In Section 3.1 we observed that Early Vedic has a construction where the T argument may receive genitive case marking and interpreted this construction as a type of antipassive strategy. I have been unable to identify any analogous examples after the Early Vedic period in the textual sample on which this study is based, and it is tempting to suggest that the lack of attestations of the antipassive construction in later stages of Vedic results from the rise of constructions like (22), where P rather than T receives genitive case marking.

(22) a. *tasya* *brāhmaṇasya* *anagnikasya* *na eva daivaṃ*

this:GEN Brahman:GEN without.fire:GEN not PTC of.gods:ACC

dadyān *na* *pitryam*

give:PRS.OPT.3SG   not   of.Pitṛs:ACC

'He (the sacrificer) may not give the (sacrificial gift) of the gods nor that of the fathers to the Brahman who has neglected the sacred fire' (Gopatha Brāhmaṇa I 2.23)

b. **tasya** *ha* *śataṃ* *dattvā* *sa* *tam* *ādāya*

he:GEN PTC   hundred give:ABS   he:NOM he:ACC   take:ABS

so *'raṇyād* *grāmam* *eyāya*

<pre>
he:NOM   wilderness:ABL   village:ACC   go:PRF.3SG
</pre>

'Having given him a hundred (and) having taken him, he went out of the wilderness and to the village' (Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 7.15)[43]

Cases like these represent early and sporadic examples of a tendency to substitute the genitive for the dative, eventually resulting in the almost complete loss of the dative as a distinct morphological case category in Epic Sanskrit[44] and Early Middle Indo-Aryan.[45] From the perspective of the present work, however, the innovative use of the genitive to express the P argument has no impact on the typology of the default ditransitive construction, which remains indirective, but may be taken to block the emergence of antipassive constructions like the one illustrated in (9) above.

Just like in previous stages of the language, we find one clear-cut instance of a secundative ditransitive construction in Late Vedic, where P has accusative case marking and T locative marking with the verb *ā-bhaj-* 'apportion'. Consider the examples in (23).

(23) a. *evám evá etad yá̄*   *imā́ḥ*   *prajā*

PTC PTC PTC   REL:NOM.PL   those:NOM.PL creature:NOM.PL

áparābhūtats   **tā́**   **yajña**   *ā́bhajati*

not.forlorn:NOM.PL   these:ACC.PL   sacrifice:LOC   apportion:PRS.3SG

'and therefore he makes those creatures here on earth that are not forlorn, take part in the sacrifice' (ŚBM I 5.2.4 after Eggeling 1882: 139-140)

b. *tathā no   'nvīkṣasva*

thus   we:ACC watch.over:PRS.IMP.2SG

*yathā **na**   **etasmin**   **loke**   *anvābhajā*

that   we:ACC this:LOC   world:LOC   apportion:PRS.SBJ.2SG

'Watch over us thus, that you give us a share in this world' (JB II 400)

Turning now to the third class of ditransitive predicates within the scope of the present paper, we note that *verba dicendi* show the expected indirective pattern when used ditransitively, as illustrated in (24).

(24) a. *aham **idam**   *na*   *eva*   **kasmai**   *cana* **avocaṃ**

---

[43] Cf. Keith's (1920: 303) translation 'Having given a hundred for him, taking him, he went from the wild to the village.' Furthermore, he remarks that '*tasya* may mean 'to him' as usually taken, but this is not necessary' (Keith 1920: 303, n. 11).

[44] Cf. e.g. Oberlies (2003: 331-332).

[45] Cf. e.g. von Hinüber (1968: 179-198, 223-266).

> I:NOM this:ACC not PTC who:DAT PTC say:AOR.1SG
>
> *manasy eva me 'bhūt kas **ta idam** avocad*
>
> mind:LOC PTC I:GEN be:AOR.SG who:NOM you:DAT this:ACC say:AOR.3SG
>
> 'I have not said this to anyone, it has only been in my mind. Who has said this to you?' (JB II 126)

b.　*yád aham kím ca véda*

　　rel:ACC I:NOM what:ACC PTC know:PRF.1SG

　　***sárvam** aham **tat** **túbhyam** ávocam*

　　all:ACC I:NOM that:ACC you:DAT say:AOR.1SG

　　'Whatever I know I have taught it all to you' (ŚBM XIV 9.1.6)

In the previous section, we noted that *verba dicendi* tend not to show neutral alignment in Middle Vedic, as reflected in the TS, unlike in Early Vedic, where verbs of this type sometimes show neutral alignment. In the Late Vedic sources we have examined, there are indeed some examples of speech act verbs selecting a neutral ditransitive pattern, as illustrated by the examples in (25).

(25)　a.　*te 'bruvan **prajāpatim** eva **imām** **sahasratamīm***

　　　　they:NOM say:IPF.3PL Prajāpati:ACC PTC this:ACC thousandth:ACC

　　　　yācāmahā iti te prajāpatim eva tām sahasratamīm

　　　　ask:PRS.SBJ.1PL QP they:NOM Prajāpati:ACC PTC that:ACC thousandth:ACC

　　　　ayācanta

　　　　ask:IPF.1PL

　　　　'They said: "Let us ask Prajāpati for the thousandth (cow)". They asked Prajāpati for the thousandth cow' (JB II 253)

　　b.　***tám** evá asmā asyām **avasānam** yācati*

　　　　he:ACC PTC this:DAT this:LOC abode:ACC ask:PRS.3SG

　　　　'It is him (Yama) he solicits for an abode in this (earth) for this (dead man)' (ŚBM XIII 8.2.4 adapted from Eggeling 1900: 431)

　　c.　*súkanye **kím** tvā etád avocatām*

　　　　Sukanyā:VOC what:ACC you:ACC PTC say:AOR.3DU

　　　　'Sukanyâ, what have those two said to thee?' (ŚBM IV 1.5.10 after Eggeling 1885: 274)

Given that speech act verbs occur in the neutral construction in Late Vedic, the question arises whether the lack of attestations of this construction in Middle Vedic reflects the fact that it was close to obsolete at this stage of the language and then gained in productivity again or whether

it is due to an accidental gap in the Middle Vedic corpus. In the present context, it seems that the latter option is more likely, because we have seen that the system of ditransitive encoding in Vedic is rather conservative, seemingly showing a high degree of lexicalization, with individual verbs or verb classes tending to select particular construction types. This tendency appears to remain remarkably stable in diachrony, with certain verbs, like *ā-BHAJ-* 'apportion', consistently selecting an idiosyncratic secundative construction throughout the entire period under scrutiny.

4 Discussion

We noted in the introduction that there is considerable variety across languages as to how the system of ditransitives is organized, and that individual languages may have several ditransitive construction (cf. Malchukov, Haspelmath and Comrie 2010: 2). Given that the inventory of ditransitive predicates often is rather limited, one would expect some languages to have a high degree of idiosyncratic marking within this realm. This is exactly what we find at the beginning of the Old Indo-Aryan linguistic tradition, where we find no less than three types of ditransitive encoding, subject to more or less strict lexical distributional constraints. In Section 3.1 we saw that the indirective construction where T is marked by the accusative and R by the dative represents a kind of default ditransitive construction in Early Vedic, while the neutral construction are limited to speech act verbs, and the secundative construction with a locative-marked T and an accusative-marked R occurs with a single verb only, *ā-bhaj-* 'apportion', which consistently selects this argument realization pattern. From a general perspective, one might expect this kind of variation within a relatively restricted area of grammar to be diachronically unstable and likely to change in the course of time. Having examined the diachronic behaviour of ditransitive predicates in Vedic Sanskrit through the approximately 600 years covered by the available sources, we may now conclude that there is remarkable diachronic stability in the encoding system of ditransitive predicates in this language. This fact may be taken to suggest that Vedic represents a type of language where case marking to a large extent is lexically determined and that general linking rules play a less central role, at least in the encoding of ditransitive predicates. It is tempting to connect this property of ditransitive constructions with a more general fact about Old Indo-Aryan noted in the introduction, that it is permissive towards non-canonical object realization patterns, which often show considerable lexical idiosyncrasy (cf. e.g. Dahl 2009, 2014a, 2014b, Forthcoming). Consider, by way of illustration, the examples in (26).

(26) a. *ayáṃ*   *ha*   **túbhyaṃ**   *váruṇo*   *hṛṇīte*

         this:NOM   PTC   you:DAT   Varuṇa:NOM   be.angry:PRS.3SG

         'Varuṇa now is angry with you.' (Rigveda VII 86.3 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 991)[46]

     b. *yadā́*   *satyáṃ*   *kṛṇuté*   *manyúm*   *índro*

         when   real:acc   make:PRS.MID.3SG   fury:ACC   Indra:NOM

         víśvaṃ   *dṛḷháṃ*   *bhayata*   *éjad*   **asmā́t**

         everything:NOM firm:NOM become.afraid:PRS.MID.3SG moving:NOM he:ABL

         'When Indra makes his fury real, everything, both what stays firm and what flinches, becomes afraid before him' (Rigveda IV 17.10 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 583)[47]

These examples illustrate that an experiential verb like *har^i*- 'be angry' selects a P argument in the dative (*túbhyam*), whereas a verb like *bhay^i*- 'become afraid' selects a P argument in the ablative (*asmāt*).

On the other hand, the assumption that case marking is determined by lexical semantic factors rather than general linking rules is in apparent conflict with another observation made in the introduction, that non-canonical subject constructions are infrequently met with in Old Indo-Aryan, so that A/S arguments receive nominative case almost without exception, a fact suggesting that nominative case is assigned on grammatical rather than lexical semantic basis. A third factor we need to take into account concerns the fact that Early Vedic has developed consistently nominative-accusative verbal agreement, an innovative feature of this language compared with other Indo-European languages such as Hittite, Ancient Greek and the closely related Old Iranian language Avestan. The pertinent data concern neuter gender nouns, which in their plural form trigger plural verb agreement in Early Vedic, as illustrated in (27a) but do not regularly do so in Gatha Avestan, Hittite and Ancient Greek, as illustrated in (27b), (27c) and (27d), respectively. Indeed, there are a couple of marginal examples of this in Early Vedic as well, as illustrated in (27e).[48]

(27) a. **víśvāny**   *atasā́*   **vánāni**   *ná*   *arvā́g*   *índraṃ*

         all:N.NOM.PL   shrubs:N.NOM.PL tree:N.NOM.PL   not   close   Indra:ACC

---

[46] Cf. Geldner (1952b: 257): 'Dieser Varuṇa grollt dir.'

[47] Cf. Geldner (1952a: 439): 'Wenn Indra seinen Eifer wahr macht, dann fürchtet sich vor ihm alles Feste (und) Bewegliche.'

[48] Here, unlike in the other examples, the gender of the subject noun is given in order to facilitate

        pratimā́nāni   *debhuḥ*

        equivalent:NOM.PL   deceive:PRF.3PL

        'All the bushes and trees have not deceived Indra as near-equivalents (of soma)'

        (RV X 89.5 after Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1536)[49]

b.   *apē̆≈ya*   *uddār*   *qatamma*   *lagāru*

        these:ABS≈and   word:ABS.PL so   fall:IMP.3SG

        'And thus these words shall fall' (Hittite; KBo 2.3 iii 21-22)

c.   *mazdā̊*   *saxᵛarᵊ̄*   *mairištō*

        wise.one:NOM verse:ACC.PL   remembering:SUP

        yā   *zī*   *vāuuərəzōi*   *pairī* *ciϑīṯ*

        REL:N.NOM.PL PTC   make:PRF.MID.3SG   ADV   PTC

        'The Wise One best remembers the verses, which have been made around (here)'

        (Gatha Avestan; Yasna 29.4)

d.   *tòn*   *d'*   *oú*   *pote*   *kúmata*   *leípei*

        he:ACC PTC   not   ever   wave:NOM.PL   leave:PRS.3SG

        'The waves never leave it' (Homer Iliad 2.396)

e.   **sárvā**   **tā́**   *te*   *ápi* *devéṣv*   **astu**

        all:**N.NOM.PL** this:**N.NOM.PL** you:GEN PTC god:LOC.PL be:**PRS.IMP.3SG**

        'Let all this of yours be also among the gods' (Rigveda I 162.14 after Jamison

        & Brereton 2014: 345)[50]

Comparative data like these may be taken to suggest that neuter gender nouns prehistorically did not trigger verb agreement but appeared with the default third singular form of the verb. On this approach, the use of plural verb forms with plural forms of neuter nouns in Early Vedic (26a) represents an innovation. This is also suggested by marginal exceptions to this, like the one illustrated in (26e), representing obsolete archaisms. As argued by Cotticelli and Dahl (Forthcoming), the development of verb agreement with neuter nouns represents a stage in a broader diachronic process of accusativization across the Indo-European family, where Early Vedic is on a more advanced level than the other languages cited in (26). In recent work, Polinsky (2015) suggests that non-canonical subjects and emerging semantic (i.e. extended ergative) alignment reflect a relatively late stage in the grammaticalization of ergative markers. It is tempting to speculate that the development of consistent assignment of non-canonical

---

[49] Cf. Geldner (1952c: 285): 'Nicht haben den Indra minderwertige Ersatz(pflanzen) täuschen können.'

[50] Cf. Geldner (1952a: 223): 'All das soll von dir bei den Göttern sein.'

object realization patterns in Early Vedic have an analogous motivation, reflecting a relatively advanced stage of grammaticalization of the nominative-accusative pattern. Under this analysis, the fact that ditransitive verbs show a high degree of lexical idiosyncrasy that remains stable throughout the history of Vedic Sanskrit may be understood as being part of a more general development towards nominative-accusative alignment in the language.

5 Conclusion and outlook

In this paper, we have examined the behaviour of ditransitive predicates in Vedic Sanskrit. In Early Vedic, we find no less than three patterns of ditransitive encoding, indirective, secundative and neutral, the distribution of which is subject to more or less rigid lexical constraints. These distributional patterns remain remarkably stable throughout the history of Vedic Sanskrit, a fact we took as an indication of an ongoing process of accusativization. While the data examined here show that Vedic Sanskrit represents a language where variation patterns in the ditransitive domain show considerable diachronic persistence, a broader and more thorough study of ditransitive constructions and their behaviour in Old Indo-Aryan languages like Epic or Classical Sanskrit as well as in Middle Indo-Aryan languages like Pāli might reveal other development patterns. However, this task will have to be undertaken in future research.

References:

Bodewitz, Henk W. 1973. *Jaminīya Brāhmaṇa I 1-65. Translation and Commentary with a Study Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotra*. Leiden: Brill.

Bodewitz, Henk W. 1990. *The Jyotiṣṭoma Ritual. Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I, 66-364*. Leiden: Brill.

Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology. Second Edition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Cotticelli, Paola and Eystein Dahl. Forthcoming. 'Split-alignment, mixed alignment and non-canonical argument marking in some archaic Indo-European languages.' In Eystein Dahl (Ed.) *Intransitivity, detransitivization and realignment in Indo-European*. Submitted to Oxford University Press.

Dahl, Eystein. 2009. Some Semantic and pragmatic aspects of object alternation in Old Vedic. In *The Role of Semantics and Pragmatics in the Development of Case* [Studies in Language Companion Series 108], Jóhanna Barðdal and Shobana Chelliah (eds), 23-55. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Dahl, Eystein. 2014. 'Partitive Subjects and Objects in Indo-Iranian and beyond'. In Silvia Luraghi and Tuomas Huumo (Ed.) *Partitive Cases and Related Categories*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 417-441.

Dahl, Eystein. 2016. The origin and development of the Old Indo-Aryan predicated *-tá* construction. In Eystein Dahl and Krzysztof Stroński (Eds.) *Indo-Aryan Ergativity in Typological and Diachronic Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 63-110.

Dahl, Eystein. Forthcoming A. 'Experiencer Predicates with Multiple Object Alternation in Early Vedic.' To appear in Paola Cotticelli and Sabine Ziegler (Eds.) *Tra semantica e sintassi: Il ruolo della linguistica storica/Zwischen Semantik und Syntax: Die Rolle der Historischen Sprachwissenschaft. Atti del XLII Convegno annuale della Società Italiana di*

Glottologia/Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Verona 11-14 Ottobre 2017. Roma: Il Calamo.

Dixon, Robert M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: CUP.

Eggeling, Hans Julius. 1882. *The Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa according to the Mādhyandina School: Books I and II translated by Julius Eggeling*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Eggeling, Hans Julius. 1885. *The Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa according to the Mādhyandina School: Books III and IV translated by Julius Eggeling*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Eggeling, Hans Julius. 1900. *The Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa according to the Mādhyandina School: Books XI, XII, XIII and XIV translated by Julius Eggeling*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Geldner, Karl F. 1951a. *Der Rig-Veda. Erster Teil. Erster bis vierter Liederkreis.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Geldner, Karl F. 1951b. *Der Rig-Veda. Zweiter Teil. Fünfter bis achter Liederkreis.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Geldner, Karl F. 1951c. *Der Rig-Veda. Dritter Teil. Neunter bis zehnter Liederkreis.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Jamison, Stephanie W. and Joel P. Brereton. 2014. *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India. Translated by Stephanie W. Jamison and Joel P. Brereton*. 3 vols. Oxford: OUP.

Keith, Arthur Berriedale. 1914. *The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled Taittiriya Sanhita* translated from the original Sanskrit prose and verse by Arthur Berriedale Keith. Harvard University: Harvard Oriental Series.

Keith, Arthur Berriedale. 1920. *Rigveda Brahmanas. The Aitareya and Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇas of the Rigveda translated from the original Sanskrit by Arthur Berriedale Keith*. Harvard University: Harvard Oriental Series.

Kulikov, Leonid. 2013. Language vs. grammatical tradition in Ancient India: How real was Pāṇinian Sanskrit? Evidence from the history of late Sanskrit passives and pseudo-passives. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 34.59–91.

Malchukov, Andrej. 2014. Resolving alignment conflicts: A competing motivations approach. In Brian MacWhinney, Andrej Malchukov and Edith Moravcsik (Eds.) *Competing Motivations in Grammar and Usage.* Oxford: OUP.

Malchukov, Andrej, Martin Haspelmath and Bernhard Comrie. 2010. Ditransitive constructions: A typological overview. In Andrej Malchukov, Martin Haspelmath and Bernard Comrie (Eds.) Studies in Ditransitive Constructions: A Comparative Handbook. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 1-64.

Oberlies, Thomas. 2003. *A Grammar of Epic Sanskrit*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

von Hinüber, Oskar. 1968. *Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pāli besonders der Vinaya-Piṭaka*. München: Kitzinger.

Polinski, Maria. 2016. *Deconstructing Ergativity. Two Types of Ergative Languages and Their Features*. Oxford: OUP.

Witzel, Michael. 1989. Tracing the vedic dialects. *Dialectes dans les langues indo-aryennes*. ed. by Colette Caillat, 97-265. Paris: College de France, Institut de Civilisation Indienne.

Witzel, Michael. 1995. Early Indian History: Linguistic and Textual Parameters. *Language, Material Culture and Ethnicity. The Indo-Aryans of Ancient South Asia*, ed. by George Erdosy, 85-125. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.