Heinrich Hettrich: Some remarks on the adverbal genitive in Rgvedic Sanskrit

1. The adverbal genitive appears in the RV in two variants: as possessive and partitive genitive. The possessive function of the genitive can be observed as a second complement either with the verbum substantivum or without a copula as in

(1) 10,108,5 (Gposs) utāsmākam āyudhā santī tigmā
„And to us belong sharp weapons“

On the other hand, the Gp appears a second complement after a verb of nourishing or consuming as in

(2) 9,51,3 (Gp) táva tyá indo āndhaso
devā mádhor vy āśnate
„(Of) your sweet sap, o drink, these gods consume“

This paper concentrates on the Gp and asks the following questions:

1) After which verbs can the Gp appear?
2) Which nouns can be used in the Gp?
3) With which other cases does the Gp compete, and in which syntactic functions?
4) Is there a semantic difference between the Gp and the competing cases or are relations desemanticized and only governed by the verb?

2.1. Question no. 1: Gaedicke (l.c. [fn. 2]) and Delbrück (l.c. [fn. 2]) distinguish between the following semantic verbal classes:

a) verbs of nourishing or consuming (see ex. 2),

b) verbs with the meaning „to give, to supply with“,

c) verbs of striving for, begging, reaching (for) something,

d) verbs meaning „to rule over, to dispose of“,

e) verbs of mental activity,

f) verbs of being glad of

Each of these classes belongs to one of two higher level typological groups: the first group consists of classes a, b, and c; d, e, and f belong to the second group. The

---

1 I am indebted to Annick Payne for correcting my english text.
2 Abbreviations: A = accusative, Dfin = dativus finalis, Gp = genitivus partitivus, Gposs = genitivus possessivus, I = instrumental, L = locative, N = nominative. All vedic text citations are from the Rgveda (RV).
4 Gaedicke (l.c., [fn. 2]) included some instances, who are scarcely to be viewed as partitive; Delbrück (1888: 158ff.) apparently considers only the genitives in classes a - c, not in classes d - f, as partitive.
allocation of classes c and f, meanwhile, is not totally clear as there is some affinity to the respective other group.

Let us begin with a discussion of group 1. The following verbs belong to this group:

class a:

ad „to eat“; asi „to consume“; gar „to devour“; ghas „to consume“; jos „to enjoy“; pā „to drink“; bhaj (middle) „to enjoy as a share“; bhas „to devour, to crush; reh „to lick“;

class b:

- kar „to construct, to get/bring here“; -cay „to load with“; dasasy „to afford“; da „to give“; dhā „to procure“; pay „to (make) swell“; par „to fill, to mix“; bhar „to bring“; mā „to allot“; yam „to grant“; yav „to connect, to arrest“; rapš „to exuberate“; van „to gain, to provide“; vardh „to support“; varš „to pour“; vah „to carry, to bring“; ūk „to procure“; sa „to gain“.

class c:

āp „to reach“; īsanyišudhy „to ask for“; īd „to beg for“; kālkam „to desire, to strive for“; krap „to long for“; praš „to ask for, to request for“; vā „to beg for“; vay „to strive for“.

2.2. Nouns which can take the Gp after these verbs are scarcely subject to any lexical constraint. But there is one condition, namely that the concept of a partitive relation must be possible. Most nouns are therefore mass nouns; abstract and concrete nouns are considerably less common. Some typical examples are:

mass nouns: sóma-, mádhu- „sweetness“; ándhas- „Soma plant“ (and other metonymical designations of the soma); pāyas- „milk“; havis- „libation“; rayi- „wealth“; vásu- „good“; yáva- „barley“; várya- „desirable“; vája- „booty“; ūrj- „nourishment, strength“

abstract nouns: amītā- „immortality“; śāvas- „power“; sakhyā- „friendship“

concrete nouns and persons: uṣās- „dawn“; mārtā- „human being“; phálā- „fruit“; deṣṇā- „gift“; gāv- „cow“; bheṣajā- „medicament“.

2.3.1. Sentences of the first type show syntactic opposition of Gp an A. Compare example (2) with Gp and the following example belonging to class a with A:

( 3) 7,67,7 (A) aśnātā havyām mánuṣiṣu vikṣū „enjoying the libation among the human clans.“

For asi „to consume“ cp. now Krisch 2006: 587f.
The following two sentences with dā „to give“ and, respectively, Gₚ and/or A belong to class b:

(4) 7,28,5 (Gₚ) mahó rāyó rādhaso yād dādan nah „in order that he should give us of the great wealth, of (his) gift“

(5) 2,32,5 (A) yābhir dādāsi dāśuṣe vāsūni „with whom you give goods to the sacrificer“

From class c, compare example (6) with Gₚ and example (7) with A:

(6) 7,27,1 (Gₚ) śāvasaś cakānāḥ „striving for strength“

(7) 5,44,15 (A) agnir jāgāra tām īcāh kāmayante „Agni is awake. Him desire the verses.“

2.3.2. Furthermore, the Gₚ can also compete with the I, namely with verbs of ‘supplying with something’ which exhibit the so-called ‘ornative’ construction that is to say the addressee takes the A, and the substance referred to is represented in the I, as in the following two sentences:

(8) 1,76,5 (I) yāthā ... havirbhīr devān ayajāḥ „as you worshipped the gods with libations“

(9) 2,14,10 (I) pāyasōdhār yāthā gōḥ sōmebhīr im pṛṇatā ... indram „As with milk the udder of the cow, [in the same way] fill Indra with soma!“

Compare ex. (10) and ex (8), also ex. (11) and ex. (9) which have the Gₚ in the same syntactic slot as the I:

(10) 3,53,2 (Gₚ) sómasya nú tvā sūṣutasya yaksi „Now I will worship you with [some] well-pressed soma.“

(11) 6,69,7 (Gₚ) sómasya dasrā jāṭhāram pṛṇethām „With [some] soma, o masters, fill your belly!“

There are also intransitive sentences with ornative construction and Gₚ instead of I, for example

Compare also from class b 6,44,20 with both cases: prā tūḥhyam ... sutānām ... bharantī ... sōmam.
4

(12) 1,37,5 (Gp)  
jāmbhe rāsasya vārydhe  
"I have strengthened myself with sap between the teeth."  

As a substitute of the I, the Gp is not affected by the difference between transitive and intransitive construction7.

2.3.3. Finally, there is a third and extremely rare construction of the partitive genitive; I could only find the following two attestations in the RV:

(13) 2,19,1 (Gp)  
ápāyy asyāndhaso mādāya  
"Of this drink has been drunk for exhilaration"  

(14) 6,63,3 (Gp)  
ākāri vām āndhasaḥ  
"It was prepared for you of this drink"  

In these sentences, the Gp occupies the position of the subject in a passive construction8, corresponding to the direct object in active constructions and competing with the N as the by far prevailing case of the subject, as in the next example:

(15) 6,44,8  
ṛtāya pathi vedhā apāyi  
"In the path of truth, the master was drunk."  

2.3.4. Thus, on the whole there are three different types of construction with the partitive genitive with verbs of classes a-c. However, these show a special semantic agreement:

In general linguistics, one has long since agreed on the complement connected most closely with the verb: with two-place verbs, it is the most patient-like complement; with three-place verbs, it is the complement which denotes the object transferred – not the addressee – regardless of the expression of this complement by the A or – in an ornative construction – by the I, and in one-place constructions in the passive, this complement surfaces as subject, as in examples (13) and (14).

Irrespective of the difference in construction, the complement connected most closely with the verb is itself designated 'internal argument' or 'erstzubindender Term'9. Accordingly, a simple rule emerges for the use of the Gp in verbal classes a-c: It is only the lexical concept underlying the internal argument (erstzubindender Term) which can surface as a Gp if it is affected only partially by the verbal process – irrespective of the three-, two- or one-place construction of the sentence. For the expression of other arguments, the Gp cannot be used10.

7 See further 4,45,1 madhūno vi rapṣate; 5,73,8 māḍhvah ... pipyuṣi.
8 The examples of other ancient IE languages with Gp as subject (adduced by Delbrück 1893: 332; Wackernagel 1953: 1120 and Chantraine 1963: 50ff.) are also intransitive or passive sentences.
10 As the data collected by Delbrück 1893: 308ff. and Brugmann 1911: 565ff. show, that what is a rule in Ṛgvedic language is only a tendency in other IE languages. – Syntactically, the genitive of local or temporal determination (see Delbrück 1893: 356ff.; Brugmann 1911: 568f.) has to be classified as a satellite, but not as
2.3.5. It should further be pointed out that there are no obvious morphosyntactical factors which restrict the use of the $G_p$ or determine the choice between $G_p$ and competing cases. Consider the following examples of $G_p$ with opposing syntactic categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opposing Categories</th>
<th>$G_p$ Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>active vs. middle</td>
<td>3,36,10 prá yandhi rāyāḥ vs. 3,53,2 sōmasya ... tvā ... yakṣī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present- vs. aorist- vs. perfect-stem</td>
<td>6,44,13 prá ... sutānāṁ ... bhara vs. 3,30,19 ni te deṣṇāsyā dhīmahi vs. 2,11,10 papivān sutāsyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affected vs. effected object</td>
<td>5,30,11 pūnar gāvāṁ adadāt vs. 6,63,3 ākāri āndhasaḥ (passive with underlying effected object)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite vs. definite noun</td>
<td>8,71,9 vásva úpa māsi vs. 10,8,9 viśvārūpasya góṇāṁ ācakrāṇāḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>singular vs. plural noun</td>
<td>10,142,3 bāpsad ... úlapasya vs. 10,28,3 ātsi tēśāṁ [sc. vṛṣabhāṇāṁ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4. Besides ist restriction to the internal argument (2.3.4.), the use of $G_p$ depends on semantic conditions only: "Der Genitiv unterscheidet sich von dem Akkusativ [und ggf. dem I., H.H.] dadurch, dass bei dem Gen. der Verbalbegriff nicht auf den vollen Umfang des Substantivbegriffs zu beziehen ist. Er ist sozusagen ein verengerter Akkusativ." (Delbrück 1893: 308).11 This description is today as valid as always but must be qualified in a somewhat different way for the two typological groups 1 (classes a-c) and 2 (classes d-f). The following characteristics apply to most verbs of the first group:

The verbal action refers from the beginning only to a part of the patientive nominal concept but affects this part completely:

Type 1:

![fig. 1](an argument or complement. – In 3,16,3 sā tvām no rāyāḥ śiśiḥ, the $G_p$ seems exceptionally be used as a substitute of a Dfin as satellite; cf. 7,18,2 śiśiḥ rāyē asmān.  

11 Similarly Gōtō 2002: 26.)
Typical examples are amongst others e.g. 2,11,10 *papiván sutásya*; 3,36,10 *asmé prá yandhi ... rāyāḥ*; 5,62,7 *sanéma mádhvaḥ*. However, some examples of class c (as for 7,27,1 *sávastas cakānāḥ*) are not confined to such a description but represent transitions between first and second group (see below ch. 3.3.).

### 2.5.

It has to be noted that after verbs of group 1, there are fewer instances of the G<sub>p</sub> than of the competing cases A or I, respectively. Compare the number of instances with the following exemplary list of selected verbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>A Instances</th>
<th>G Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ad</td>
<td>&quot;to eat&quot;</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&quot;to consume&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āp</td>
<td>&quot;to reach&quot;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kā/kam&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&quot;to desire&quot;</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krap&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&quot;to long for&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gar&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&quot;to devour&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghas</td>
<td>&quot;to consume&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jōš</td>
<td>&quot;to enjoy&quot;</td>
<td>ca. 180</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dā</td>
<td>&quot;to give&quot;</td>
<td>ca. 300</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>par&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&quot;to fill&quot;</td>
<td>ca. 20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parc</td>
<td>&quot;to fill, to mix&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pā</td>
<td>&quot;to drink&quot;</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prāš</td>
<td>&quot;to ask for&quot;</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhaj (middle)</td>
<td>&quot;to enjoy as a share&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhār</td>
<td>&quot;to bring&quot;</td>
<td>ca. 300</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhās</td>
<td>&quot;to devour&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reh</td>
<td>&quot;to lick&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vāy&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&quot;to strive for&quot;</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vah</td>
<td>&quot;to carry, to bring&quot;</td>
<td>ca. 240</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numerical relation alone suggests that the opposition between, respectively, A or I and G after these verbs is privative – with the G<sub>p</sub> as the marked member. Careful examination of the data confirms this suggestion: A and I can both be used with neutral or complete inclusion as well as with only partial inclusion of the relevant concept into the state-of-affairs, the G<sub>p</sub> is more restricted and can only be used with partial inclusion of this concept<sup>12</sup>. Compare the following instances:

(16) 8,77,4 (complete inclusion, A)<sup>13</sup>

*ěkayā pratidhāpi bat sākāṁ sārāṁsi trīṇśātām*

"In only one go he drunk up three hundred lakes together."

---

<sup>12</sup> See also Brugmann 1911: 568: „Der Gegensatz zwischen dem Objektgenitiv und dem Objektsakkusativ ist aber nicht etwa immer der gewesen, dass der Genitiv einen Teil, der Akkusativ das Ganze betonte, sondern der Akkusativ steht ganz gewöhnlich auch dann, wenn es nur auf die Gattung im Gegensatz zu anderen Gattungen ankommt und die Quantität dahingestellt bleibt.“

<sup>13</sup> Cf. also 10,102,4 *udnō hradām apihaj jārhyṣānāh, 1,84,20 viśvā ca na upamimihī mānūsa l vāsūni caśanībyā ā, 4,27,2 nā ghā sā mām āpa jōṣaṁ jahāra.*
(17) 7,74,2/3 (partial inclusion, A and G in parallel construction)\(^{14}\)

\[ \text{pibataṁ somyam mādhuv} \]
\[ \\ yātam úpa bhūṣatam mādhyāh pibataṁ aśvinā \]

"Drink ye the somic sweetness!"

Come here, turn up to here!

Drink of the sweetness, o Aśvins!"

similarly with I vs. G\(^{p}\)

(18) 2,2,1 (complete inclusion, I)

\[ \text{agnim yajadhvaṁ havīśa tānā girā} \]

"worship Agni with a libation, with a continuous song!"

(19) 5,34,2 (partial inclusion, I)

\[ \text{ā yāḥ sōmena jāṭhāram apiiprata} \]

"who filled his belly with soma"

(20) 6,69,7 (partial inclusion, G\(^{p}\))

\[ \text{sómasya dasrā jāṭhāram pṛṃthām} \]

"With soma, o masters, fill your belly!"\(^{15}\)

2.6. As the examples above illustrate, with most relevant verbs, the G\(^{p}\) is rare. It can therefore not be excluded that this case could in principle also be used with other verbs, there simply happens to be no evidence for it. It is thus possible that Delbrück's classes do not define limits of use but only preferences. The following points would be in favour of this:

a) Class b in particular is semantically heterogeneous. Some verbs (e.g. pay\(^{i}\) "to (make) swell", yaj "to sacrifice, to worship", yav "to unite, to fasten") can be subsumed only with difficulty under the cover term "to give, to supply with".

b) In addition to the verbs mentioned so far, there are others with which the G\(^{p}\) can be observed but which do not belong to classes a-c (or d-f)\(^{16}\):

\[ \text{dar\(^{i}\) "to tear, to drag"} \]

(21) 7,55,4

\[ \text{tvāṁ sūkarāsyā dardṛhi} \]
\[ \text{tāva dardartu sūkarāḥ} \]

"You should drag on the boar, and the boar should drag on you!"

---

\(^{14}\) See also with partial inclusion 4,18,3 tvāṣṭur grhē apibat somam indrāḥ l śatadhanyāṁ camvoh sutāsya; 2,11,13 rayim rāśi; 2,32,5 dādāśi ... vāsānī.

\(^{15}\) The same correspondence between (partial) I and G\(^{p}\) can be observed in 6,15,11 (I) tām it pṛṃkti sāvasotā rāyā vs. 7,100,2 (G\(^{p}\) pārcaḥ yātāh naḥ suvatāsya ... rāyāh.

\(^{16}\) See Gaedicke, l.c. (fn. 2), Gotö 2002: 26f.
**jambh** „to snap, snatch“

(22) 10,86,4  
śvá ny ṣasya jambhiṣad āpi kārne  
„The dog should snatch at him, at his ear.“

**han** „to slay“

(23) 2,23,12  
yó … śāsāṁ ugro mānyamāno jīhaṁsati  
„whoever, thinking oneself powerful, wants to break some (of the) commandment(s)“

In the end, classes a-c do not constitute precisely circumscribed verb classes but only semantically nuclear domains of the \(G_p\), apart from which, however, in appropriate cases, the \(G_p\) is not excluded\(^{17}\).

In some cases of class c, the function of the G seems to be ambiguous. Partially, the scheme of ch. 2.4. seems to apply (e.g. 7,24,5 īṣte vāsūnām; 9,108,4 āpire … amṛṭasya). However, there are some cases which can belong to a second type of partitivity, to be described in detail in ch. 3.3.; e.g. 7,27,1 śāvasaś cakānāh „striving for strength“; 1,93,7 haviṣah … vītām „strive for the libation!“. In such cases, it is not impossible to view the state-of-affairs as referring to the patientive concept in its totality but affecting it only partially; cf. fig. 2 in ch. 3.3. Apparently, class c contains some cases bordering on group 2.

**2.7.** Let us now sum up the most important results on the first variant of the \(G_p\)

a) With the first variant of the \(G_p\) the agent refers only to a part of the patientive concept but affects this part completely (2.4.).

b) Among the nouns which take the \(G_p\) mass nouns and abstract nouns are by far prevailing. However, nouns belonging to other semantic classes are not excluded (2.2.).

c) Verbal predicates predominantly consist of verbs of nourishing/consuming, verbs of transfer and verbs of striving, begging, reaching for something (2.1., 2.6.).

d) The \(G_p\) can exhibit a syntactic competition with A, I and N. It always designates the „internal argument“ (2.3.1.-4.).

e) The \(G_p\) is the marked member of a privative opposition with A or I, respectively. It is much rarer than the unmarked members A and I. The positive feature of the opposition is the only partial implication of the patientive concept, as described in ch. 2.4.

\(^{17}\) Some examples of \(G_p\) with other verbs from AV and Vedic prose, which also belong to group 1, are to be found in Delbrück 1888: 159ff. and Gotô 2002: 26.
3.1. Now we shall consider the second group of \(G_p\) constructions with the following verb classes

d) "to rule over, to dispose of",
e) verbs of mental activity,
f) "to be glad of, to enjoy".

In these classes, too, the \(G_p\) is restricted to the designation of the 'internal argument' and competes with the A, in some cases also with L and I. Here are some examples from class e with *man* "to remember, to think up, to imagine"\(^{18}\):

\[
\begin{align*}
(24) &5,22,3 \ (G_p) \quad \text{vāreṇyasya té 'vasa} \\
&i yānāso amanmahi \\
&"Imploring we have remembered your desirable aid." \\
(25) &5,13,2 \ (A) \quad \text{agné stómam manāmahe} \\
&s idhyám adyā divispṛśaḥ \\
&"Let's think out a hymn for/of Agni, a successful [song] for/of [him, who] touches the heaven." \\
\end{align*}
\]

For further consideration of cases used with *man*, see ch. 3.4.6. below.

3.2. The considerably varying distribution of both cases in classes d-f already indicates that the semantic relationship between G and A in these classes is different from that of group 1.

Compare the most important verbs of d-f\(^{19}\):

(d) "to rule over, to dispose of"

\[
\begin{align*}
iś &\quad "\text{to dispose of, to rule over}" \quad 4 \ A : 95 \ G \\
kṣā &\quad "\text{to rule over, to dispose of}" \quad 1 \ A : 17 \ G \\
irajyā- &\quad "\text{to rule over, to dispose of, to straighten, to guide}" \quad 2 \ A : 7 \ G \\
rāj &\quad "\text{to extend, to rule over}" \quad 10 \ A : 28 \ G \\
pat &\quad "\text{to possess, to rule over}" \quad 17 \ A : \text{no} \ G \ (\text{besides } 2 \text{ I, } 3 \text{ L})
\end{align*}
\]

(e) verbs of mental activity

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ádhi – ay/} &\quad "\text{to regard, to consider, to mind}" \quad 5 \ A : 7 \ G \\
\text{gam/gā} &\quad "\text{to mention, to celebrate}^{20}\ " \quad \text{no} \ A : 8 \ G
\end{align*}
\]

---

\(^{18}\) See Hettrich 2004: 75ff.

\(^{19}\) Apart from the verbs arranged in the following survey, there are some others with very few attestations of the \(G_p\): pāri-khyā "to forget, to ignore" (5,65,6 maghónaḥ, asmákam); dhay \(^{1}\) "to consider" (7,7,6 asyā ... ṭāśya); śās "to rule over" (8,34,1 divó amúsya).
**cet** „to perceive, to take care of, to comprehend” ca. 50 A : 16 G

**bodh** „to be regardful of” 8 A : 16 G

**man** „to remember, to imagine” 31 A : 5 G

**ved** „to realize, to know” ca. 130 A : ca. 60 G

**śrav, ā-ghoṣ** „to hear” content of noise: A
source of noise: G

(f) „to be glad of, to enjoy”

**kan’/can’** „to be glad of” 3 A : 5 G (besides 2 I : 11 L)

**tarp** „to enjoy” 1 A : 8 G

**mad/mand** „to be intoxicated, to enjoy” 8 A : ca. 30 G (besides, ca. 15 L, ca. 35 I)

3.3. These numbers suffice to show that the opposition between the two cases after these verbs is not privative. In order to explain the great fluctuation between A and Gp with these verbs, we must first take into account the low degree of transitivity in terms of Hopper-Thompson. Predominantly, in Vedic as in the other IE languages, the second complement of a verb takes the A. Thus holds, as a rule, when the degree of transitivity is high with a clear-cut difference between agent and patient. With decreasing levels of transitivity, vacillation occurs and other cases, such as the G, begin to compete with the A.

In this transitional sphere, the following principle holds: The more the referent of the second complement, that is to say the patient, is affected by or incorporated in the domain of the agent, the more the A prevails; the weaker this incorporation, the more the Gp prevails. This holds as a general rule; however, we have to accept some vacillation. The decisive factors for the degree of incorporation are, on the one hand, the degree of patient-oriented dynamicity of the verb caused by its lexical meaning or grammatical category (e.g. diathesis, aspect), on the other hand, as an opposing factor, the degree of conceptual autonomy of the patient or patient-like concept, its individuality and ability to react. These factors operate against each other – the first in favour of the A, the second of the Gp – in a manner which differs from one verb to the next, and the scales turn the balance partly in favour of the A, partly of the Gp. In this way, the different distributions of A and Gp after various verbs of group 2 can be explained globally but it remains difficult or in some cases even impossible to find out why in one given sentence the Gp is used and in another the A.

---

20 In the examples with passive construction 10,22,1; 10,105,4 (cārkṣṣe); 10,50,2 (carkṭyabh) the subject nominative, however, can in principle be explained as a transformation of an accusative of the active source construction.

21 The instances with the present stem mānya- and the meaning „to consider, think” are not to be taken into account here.


As a consequence this result shows that the function of the $G_p$ in sentences of group 2 is not the same as in those of type 1 (see 2.4. above). In type 2, the verbal action refers to the patientive nominal concept in its totality but affects it only partially.

Type 2:

3.4. The opposing factors just mentioned can be realized with different verbs in a different and not predictable manner. This can be illustrated with some select verbs from classes d-f

3.4.1. *iś* "to dispose of, to rule over":

(26) 3,16,5 (G)  
\[
\text{rāyā īše svapatyāsyā gōmata} \\
\text{īše vṛtrahāṭhānām} \\
\text{"He [sc. Agni] disposes of wealth, consisting of good offspring, he disposes of the killings of Vṛtra."}
\]

(27) 8,25,20 (G)  
\[
\text{vāco dṛghāprasadmanī-} \\
\text{-śe vājasya gōmataḥ} \\
\text{īše hi pītvō viśāsyā dāvāne} \\
\text{"A word of/with Dirghaprasadman disposes of wealth in form of cows, disposes of non-toxic nourishment, for giving [it]."}
\]

As can be seen from the table in 3.2., with *iś* we find 95 instances with $G_p$ and only 4 with A. This distribution matches the observation that the precise lexical meaning of this verb, in Delbrück's words, is "nicht bewältigen, sondern Gewalt haben an" (Delbrück 1893: 308, Brugmann 1911: 595). In other words only the subject's ability to dispose of the object or to have some control over it is expressed, but not yet an action already performed and affecting the object as a kind of patient. In the last example (27), such an action would only be realized through fulfilment of the dative action noun *dāvāne*. In this respect, the use of $G_p$ with *iś* corresponds to the general use of $G_p$ with verbs of classes d-f.

The few instances with A do not contradict this rule. The next example shows an overlap of the two cases:

(28) 7,32,18 (G + A)  
\[
yād indra yāvatas tvām \\
etāvad ahām iśīya \\
\text{"If, o Indra, I myself disposed of so many [things] as you"}
\]
Here, it is understandable that the A takes part as well: because the second complement is constituted by a semantically empty neuter form of a pronoun, we have the weakest possible degree of conceptual autonomy.

The following example is very different:

(29) 7,37,7 abhi yām devī nirṛtiś cid īše
"Even if the divine Nirṛti has power over him [sc. Indra]"

Here, the conceptual independence of Indra is out of question and should require the Gp. However the goal-oriented LP abhi indicates that this independence is (over)compensated by Nirṛti. In such a special case, this leads to an accusative object.

3.4.2. rāj „to extend, to rule over"

The following are typical examples with Gp and A, respectively:

(30) 5,63,2 (Gp) saṁrājāv asyā bhūvanasya rājatho
mitrāvārunā vidāthe svardāśa
"As overall rulers, you rule over this world, Mitra and Varuṇa, sun-like, at the distribution"

(31) 5,8,5 (A) purūny ānnā sāhasā vi rājasi
"You rule over much nourishment with power"

The meaning of rāj has been much disputed. To my opinion, Roesler is right in her interpretation that the feature „to shine“ is not yet present in the RV as an autonomous component but at best as an implication. Rather, the meaning consists of the components „to extend over“ and „to rule over“ which are always present, even if according to the context one of the two dominates. Because of the component „to extend over“, the meaning of rāj exhibits a stronger patient-oriented dynamicity than īš; therefore the A is more frequent than with īś. Nevertheless, as the coexistence of A and Gp shows, that dynamicity exists in different gradations. It also complies with the general result for the verbs of ruling, that all 10 instances of the A after rāj have a direction- or goal-oriented local particle (āti, ānu, prā, vi), whereas the Gp exhibits such a particle (always vi) only in 4 of 28 instances.

3.4.3. Let us now have a look at the verb 2pat „to rule, possess“ which in spite of its semantic similarity to īś and rāj presents a sharp syntactic contrast to these verbs because its object takes only the A.

A typical example is

(32) 6,2,1 tvāṁ hi kṣātavad yāśo
'gne mitrō nā pātyase

24 See the overview in Roesler 1997: 173ff.
"You, o Agni, as (well as) Mitra surely possess magnificent splendour."

As the meaning of the complement nouns – here as well as in other sentences – shows, the relation of "pat" with these nouns is not the same as in the case of "ś" or "rāj". The notions connected to "ś" and "rāj" possess in most cases an autonomous existence, as "rayi-" "wealth", "bhūvana-" "creature", "vāsu-" "good", "vāja-" "prize, booty", whereas the notions combined with "pat" predominantly denote personal attributes or qualities of the agent, as for example "sāvas-" "strength", "ōjās-" "power", "yāsas-" "splendour", "tāviṣi-" "force", "śrī-" "splendour, excellence". Concepts like these are scarcely autonomous; they rather pertain to the agent as a person and refer to his disposition. Thus, the use of the A conforms to the general rule.

3.4.4. Now, we have to comment on some verbs of mental activity, firstly on cet "to perceive, to take care of, to comprehend":

(33)  4,45,6  (A)  
viśvān ānu svadhāyā cetathas pathāḥ  
"Through your own power you perceive all ways."

(34)  1,128,4  (G)  
agnir yajñasyādharāsya cetati  
"Agni takes care of worshipping and of the sacrifice."

A comparison of the attestations of cet with other verbs of seeing or optical perception shows that with cet the receptive component has a considerable strength, compared with those of other verbs such as "darā, khyā, (s)paś. With cet, the agent does not only concentrate on the perceived object but also reflects its perception. However, on the other hand, the use of local particles ("ānu, abhi, ā, vi") in combination with cet shows that there is also a relevant degree of agentivity. Thus with cet we have a coexistence of receptive and agentive features, and this concurrence of two semantic features corresponds to the concurrence of Gp and A as cases of the second argument. A sign of slightly differing degrees of agentivity vs. receptivity in the text's concrete instances is that with goal-oriented local particles only the A is used (see ex. 33).

3.4.5. bodh "to be regardful of" (act.)

(35)  6,23,7  (A)  
sā no bodhi purojāsāṁ ráraṇaḥ  
"Generously pay attention to our offering cake!"

(36)  2,16,7  (G)  
kuvin no asyā vācaso nibodhiṣat  
"If he will attend to this word of us?"

The active instances of this verb, with the meaning "to be regardful of" are more relevant than the middle which means "to wake up". As Gotō (1987: 220) and Kümmel (2000: 332) noticed, both of these meanings can be explained as exponents of a primary meaning "to become attentive, observant". This meaning illustrates that – in contrast to other verbs of perception – the receptive component is more prevailing than the agentive-dynamic component. Therefore, the use of the Gp cannot surprise – in
contrast to e.g. khyā „to see, to catch sight of“ or (s)pāś „to see, to look, to spy“, which can only be construed with the accusative. Moreover, it is worth noting that with bodh the second complement, if it is animate, only appears in the Gp (3,14,7 surāthasya, 6,21,5 avamāsyā, 8,9,3 kānvāsyā), whereas inanimate second complements can be expressed in both the Gp and the A (see exx. 35 and 36 above). This distribution, again, shows the relevance of conceptual autonomy resp. the second complement’s capability of reaction. This capability is greater with animate than with inanimate concepts, therefore, only the former can be expressed in the Gp.

3.4.6. man „to remember, to think up, to imagine“

The distribution of A (31 instances) vs. Gp (5 instances; see examples (24) and (25) in ch. 3.1. above) allows to conclude that with this verb the agentive-dynamic component is stronger than with bodh because the two cases are inversely distributed.

However, the fact that both cases are documented after all, shows that we, nevertheless, have to distinguish between stronger and weaker dynamicity of the verb or – inversely – stronger and weaker conceptual autonomy of the second complement. Explicitly, this difference can be observed in the following distribution: With man, the A can designate affected as well as effected objects[25], whereas only affected objects are encoded in the G. The concept of „effected object“ already entails that this type of object is more strongly incorporated in the dynamicity of the verb than an „affected“ object. However, in this case we must remain cautious: Because there are only 5 attestations of Gp with man, it cannot be excluded that an effected object in the Gp is only lacking by chance, particularly since effected objects are generally rarer than affected ones.

3.4.7. This overview will be concluded with two verbs of class f „to be glad of, to enjoy“. First, we will look at kan‘i/can‘ „to be glad of“

(37) 8,31,1 (Gp)  
brahméd indrasya cākanat  
„The brahmin well be glad of Indra“

(38) 3,28,5 (A)  
āgne tṛtiye sāvane hi kāniṣāh  
purolāśam sahasah sūnav āhutam  
„At the third pressing, o Agni, you should be glad of the offered cake, o son of strength!“

This verb is admittedly an unequivocal example of class f but because of the small number of examples for each case of the second complement (A, G, I, L; see the survey in ch. 3.2.) it is not possible to work out reliable factors determining the second argument’s choice of case.

---

[25] See the effected object in ex. (25) and also in 5,35,8 stōmam; 5,66,3 sustutīm; 8,29,10 sāma.
3.4.8. *tarp* „to enjoy“

(39) 4,46,2 (G<sub>p</sub>)  
\[वायो सुतास्य त्यपतम\]  
„Vāyu [and Indra], enjoy [of] the pressed out!“

(40) 8,70,10 (A)  
\[त्वान्दो नि त्यपसि\]  
„You devour completely the mockers of yours.“

As can be seen from the basic meaning of this verb as well as its use in these sentences, it represents a borderline case between classes a and f, but the numeric relation of A and G (see the table in 3.2.) better fits class f than class a. Even if – similarly to *kan<sub>ि</sub>c<sub>ि</sub>n<sub>ि</sub>* – the few attestations of this verb in the RV cannot suffice to gain reliable results<sup>26</sup>, it is congruent with our general observation that the only attested example 40 with A because of the metaphorical use of the verb represents a very high degree of patient-oriented dynamicity, whereas this degree in the instances with G<sub>p</sub>, as in (39), is relatively low, here the subject shows more features of an experiencer than of an agent.

3.5. Here, we shall stop discussing single verbs and try to summarize the most important results on the G<sub>p</sub> in group 2-sentences:

a) In this group, the agent refers to the nominal concept in its totality but affects it only partially (3.3.).

b) Like in group 1, in group 2 also, the G<sub>p</sub> designates only the „internal argument“.

c) In contradistinction to group 1, the opposition between A and G<sub>p</sub> with the verbs of group 2 is not privative. Rather, the use of the A or the G<sub>p</sub> respectively depends on the balance between the patient-oriented dynamicity of the verb or the agent, resp., on the one hand and the patient-like concepts ability to react on the other (3.3.). This balance changes heavily from one verb to the next and causes very different relations between both cases and the verbs in the classes d-f (3.2.).
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