

THE TYPOLOGY OF *Āmreḍita* COMPOUNDS IN THE *Ṛgveda*

Tamara DITRICH

University of Ljubljana

t.ditrich@gmail.com

Abstract

Āmreḍita compounds in the *Ṛgveda* are considered to be a type of coordinative nominal construction, closely related to *dvandva* compounds. This article investigates *āmreḍita* compounds against the background of other coordinative nominal constructions from *Ṛgveda* 1.1–1.50 which were analysed and compared with their parallel attestations in other *maṇḍalas* of the *Ṛgveda*. The first fifty hymns of the *Ṛgveda* form an organic whole: they belong to the middle period in the *Ṛgvedic* chronology and address a rich variety of deities, providing a substantial amount of material to address the typological problems of *āmreḍita* compounds. The article overviews the problems related to the typology of *āmreḍita* compounds, their analysis in the *Ṛgvedapadapāṭha* and the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, examines all *āmreḍita* compounds attested in *Ṛgveda* 1.1–1.50 and compares them with *dvandva* compounds, noting their interrelations, similarities and differences and consequently, identifies some of their typological features.

Keywords

Vedic Linguistics, *Ṛgvedic* Exegesis, Typology of Nominal Compounds, Vedic Compounds, *Āmreḍita* word-groups

Izvleček

Āmreḍita zloženke se v vedskem kot tudi v klasičnem sanskrtu ponavadi klasificirajo kot poseben tip koordinativnih nominalnih zvez, ki so v tesnem sorodstvu z *dvandva* zloženkami. Prispevek raziskuje *āmreḍita* zloženke v okviru vseh koordinativnih nominalnih zvez, ki so zabeležene v *ṛgvedskih* himnah 1.1–1.50 in jih analizira skupaj z njihovimi vzporednimi zabeležbami v vseh *maṇḍalah* *Ṛgvede*. Prvih petdeset himen *Ṛgvede* predstavlja organsko celoto: v *ṛgvedski* kronologiji pripadajo srednjemu obdobju in so posvečene številnim različnim bogovom ter nudijo dovolj obsežno gradivo za raziskovanje tipoloških vprašanj povezanih z *āmreḍita* zloženkami in drugimi koordinativnimi nominalnimi zvezami. Prispevek obravnava analizo *āmreḍita* zloženek v *Ṛgvedapadapāṭhi* in *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, analizira vse *āmreḍita* zloženke iz prvih petdesetih himn *Ṛgvede*, jih primerja z *dvandva* zloženkami in raziskuje njihove medsebojne podobnosti in razlike ter ugotavlja njihov razvoj in tipološke značilnosti.

Ključne besede

vedska lingvistika, eksegeza *Ṛgvede*, tipologija zloženek, vedske zloženke, *āmreḍita* besedne skupine

This article investigates *āmreḍita* compounds in the *Ṛgveda* which have been viewed as one type of coordinative nominal construction. Materials for this research are drawn from the first fifty hymns of the *Ṛgveda*: all coordinative nominal constructions attested in these hymns were identified, analysed and compared with their parallel attestations in other *maṇḍalas* of the *Ṛgveda*. The first fifty hymns of the *Ṛgveda* form an organic whole: they presumably belong to the middle period in the *Ṛgvedic* chronology and address a variety of deities, providing a substantial amount of material for investigation of coordinative nominal constructions, including *āmreḍita* compounds. The article investigates the problems related to the typology and development of *āmreḍita* compounds and especially their relationship with *dvandva* compounds.¹

*Āmreḍita*² compounds, also called *āmreḍita* word-groups, are comprised of an inflected form (usually a substantive, or less commonly an adjective, pronoun, adverb, preposition or numeral) which is repeated, giving the compound an intensive, distributive or iterative meaning (e.g. *divé-dive* “every day”). They are productive in the *Ṛgveda*, especially those comprised of two nouns. Before the typological questions related to *āmreḍita* compounds are addressed here, their analysis in the earliest *Ṛgvedic* exegetical text, the *Padapāṭha*, will be discussed and the approach to *āmreḍita* word-groups in the most important old Indian grammar, Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, will be examined.

1. Analysis of *Āmreḍita* Compounds in the *Ṛgvedapadapāṭha*

The *Ṛgvedapadapāṭha* (“*Ṛgveda*-word-text”) gives all the words of the *Ṛgvedasamhitāpāṭha* (“*Ṛgveda*-continuous-text”) in a separated form, unaffected by the rules of euphonic combination or *sandhi*. As the earliest exegesis of the *Ṛgveda* — the first known commentary on the *samhitā* text, dated around the end of the *Brāhmaṇa* period — its main purpose is the accurate preservation of the *Ṛgveda* during oral transmission. The text also clarifies the meaning of words and seems to be the earliest recorded grammatical analysis of the *Ṛgveda* (Jha, 1992, p. 1). In the *Ṛgvedapadapāṭha* the *sandhis* are dissolved and two kinds of pauses are used to keep separate meaningful units, i.e. they mark morpheme-boundaries or word-boundaries: a long pause (*daṇḍa*)³ always follows a *pada* (“word”) — it separates the constituents of a sentence — and a shorter one (*avagraha*)⁴ separates the constituents of a word. Components of a compound are separated by an *avagraha*: this indicates that the components are analysed in the *padapāṭha* as constituents of internal *pada*.

¹ The research leading to the results in this paper has received funding from the Seventh Framework Programme [FP7/2007-2013] under PIRG02-GA-2007-224432.

² The term *āmreḍita* means literally “repetition, reduplication” (*ā-mreḍ-* “to repeat”; see MW 147).

³ *Daṇḍa* is transliterated with a single space.

⁴ *Avagraha* is transliterated with a short hyphen - .

Nominal compounds are not always analysed in the *Ṛgveda-padapāṭha*, i.e. in some circumstances they do not have their constituents separated by an *avagraha*; for example, in compounds that have two accents and the first component in an inflected form (e.g. RV 1.90.8: Sp *vānaspátir*, Pp *vānaspátih*); in compounds that are proper names (e.g. RV 3.53.9: Sp *viśvámītro*, Pp *viśvámītraḥ*); in *dvandvas* signifying deities (*devatādvandvas*);⁵ (e.g. RV 1.93.8: Sp *agnīśómā*, Pp *agnīśómā*); in *dvandvas* with both components accented and in the dual (e.g. RV 4.6.7: Sp *mātārāpitārā*, Pp *mātārāpitārā*); and in some other types of compounds (Jha, 1992, p. 169–176).

Most nominal compounds in the *Ṛgveda* consist of two components or, rarely, of three, but never more than three. Having a single accent seems to be the first criterion for a word to be considered a compound in the *padapāṭha*: if a compound has two accents, its components are not separated by *avagraha*. The second criterion for a word to be considered a compound is the use of the uninflected stem of the first component. However, a word is often analysed in the *padapāṭha* as a compound as long as it has, with some exceptions, one accent, although the first component may be in an inflected form. This is the case with *āmreḍita* compounds which have their components separated in the *padapāṭha* since they fulfill the first criterion (i.e. they have a single accent) although the first component is always in an inflected form (e.g. RV 1.12.2: Sp *agnímagnim*, Pp *agním-agnim*).

In *Ṛgveda* 1.1–1.50, twelve *āmreḍita* compounds are attested which can be grouped in the following way:

- eight *āmreḍitas* comprising two nouns (*divédive*, *dyávidyavi*, *tuñjētuñje*, *sutésute*, *agnímagnim*, *viśéviśe*, *yógeyoge*, *vájjevāje*);
- one *āmreḍita* comprising two numerals (*ékamekam*);
- one comprising two pronouns (*táttad*); and
- two comprising prepositions (*pārāparā* and *prápra*).

All *āmreḍitas* listed above are analysed as compounds in the *padapāṭha*, i.e. their components are separated by *avagraha* (e.g. Pp *divé-dive*). These *āmreḍitas* are all, with one exception (i.e. Sp *agnímagnim*, Pp *agním-agnim*), comprised of non-theonyms. Similarly, in all other hymns of the *Ṛgveda* almost all *āmreḍitas* are formed from non-theonyms: only two deities in the entire *Ṛgveda* are addressed in *āmreḍita* compounds, i.e. Agni with three attestations of *agnímagnim* (1.12.2, 6.15.6, 8.60.17) and Indra with one attestation *índramindram* (8.12.19). All *āmreḍita* compounds from *Ṛgveda* 1.1–1.50 as well as their attestation in other *maṇḍalas* of the *Ṛgveda* have their components separated by *avagraha*. Furthermore, all *āmreḍita* compounds in the *Ṛgveda* — altogether 113 are listed by Collitz (1882, pp. 295–297), having usually only one or a few attestations each in the entire text — were examined and found to be consistently analysed in the *padapāṭha*, irrespective as to whether they are comprised

⁵ In the *Sāmaveda* the components of *devatādvandva* compounds are separated.

of theonyms or non-theonyms. This fact also supports the assumption that having a single accent seems to be the first criterion for a word to be considered a compound in the *padapāṭha*.

In comparison, examination of *dvandva* compounds in the *Ṛgvedapadapāṭha* indicates different patterns. *Dvandva* compounds comprising non-theonyms are analysed as compounds in the *padapāṭha* only when the first component is, without any ambiguity, in a stem form (e.g. RV 1.45.2: Sp *tráyastrimśatam*, Pp *tráyaḥ-trimśatam*) whereas those comprised of theonyms (which are by far the most frequent coordinative construction for theonyms in the *Ṛgveda*) are, as a rule, never analysed in the *padapāṭha*: no *devatādvandvas*, having constituents in juxtaposition or in *imesi*, have their constituents separated by *avagraha*. Although two theonyms (Indra and Vāyu, Indra and Agni) occur in *dvandva* compounds which have a single accent and the first constituent in a stem form—the two criteria that are required for the compound to be analysed in the *padapāṭha*—their components are still not separated by *avagraha* (e.g. Sp: 1.14.3ab *indravāyú*, Pp: *indravāyú iti*; Sp: 1.14.3ab *indravāyú*, Pp: *indravāyú iti*.) (Ditrich, 2009). This indicates that special criteria apply for dual theonyms: they are not analysed on the syntactic or semantic level but only on the phonetic or morphophonemic level (i.e. *sandhi*, replacement of singular endings by dual endings). Thus *dvandva* compounds cannot be viewed as a single category but a clear distinction has to be made between those comprised of theonyms and non-theonyms (Ditrich, 2007). On the other hand, *āmreḍita* groups comprising theonyms are always analysed as compounds in the *padapāṭha*; this may indicate that iterated theonyms, expressing repetition, developed later, in analogy with reiterated non-theonyms (Delbrück, 1893, p. 143). The analysis of all *āmreḍita* compounds in the *padapāṭha* indicates that having one accent is the most important criterion for a word to be considered a compound in the *padapāṭha*; this principle applies for *āmreḍitas* because they consist almost entirely of non-theonyms but not for *dvandvas* which comprise mostly theonyms and follow different principles.

2. Analysis of *Āmreḍita* Compounds in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*

Although Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the first and most important traditional Sanskrit grammar, probably from the sixth century BCE, describes the language of the late Vedic period, it also provides numerous rules for specific features of the old Vedic language and it seems that Pāṇini was well acquainted with Vedic texts, including the *Ṛgveda*. It is also quite certain that the author of the *Ṛgvedapadapāṭha* antedated Pāṇini (Ditrich, 2009); so it is curious that in the analysis of nominal compounds the concept of *pada* ("word") in the *Ṛgvedapadapāṭha* is different from the Pāṇinian concept. In the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* nominal compounds (*samāsa*) are generally treated as single words, derived by combining syntactically and semantically connected case-inflected

words (*padas*)⁶ which in the derivational process have had internal case endings deleted (P 2.4.71) — unless specified otherwise. Furthermore, there is a great difference in the analysis of *āmreḍitas* in the two texts: Pāṇini does not treat *āmreḍita* word-groups as compounds. However, in the first *pāda* of the eighth *adhyaḥya* he does provide rules for doubling whole syntactic items under various conditions. He defines the term *āmreḍita* in P 8.1.2: *tasya paramāmreḍitam* “of that which is repeated the letter [word] is called *āmreḍita*” and in P 8.1.3 (*anudāttaṃ ca*) he says that the *āmreḍita* word is not accented. In P 8.1.4 (*nityavīpsayoḥ*) he assigns to *āmreḍita* word-groups two meanings: *nitya* “always, again and again” and *vīpsā* “distributiveness”.⁷

Modern scholars have attempted to give various explanations as to why Pāṇini does not include *āmreḍita* groups among compounds. Joshi and Roodbergen (1974, xii–xiv) point out that *āmreḍita* groups only rarely show the basic characteristic of compounds — the deletion of case endings and those *āmreḍitas* that have case endings deleted are treated by Pāṇini as *bahuvrīhi* or *karmadhāraya* compounds (P 8.1.9–8.1.15). Furthermore, they argue that *āmreḍita* groups consist not only of inflected words but also of finite verbs, and Pāṇini does not allow compounds formed by finite verbs. The main reason for their exclusion from nominal composition by Pāṇini is, they believe, that the meaning of *āmreḍita* groups is not the result of composition but of repetition itself (Joshi & Roodbergen, 1974, pp. 8–9). Cardona thinks that the reason for the exclusion of *āmreḍita* groups from nominal composition by Pāṇini is to be found in the structural system of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.⁸ It is quite certain that Pāṇini knew Śākalya’s *Ṛgvedapadapāṭha*, in which *āmreḍita* groups are treated as compounds. The question as to why Pāṇini did not adopt Śākalya’s procedure has not been convincingly answered yet.

The *Aṣṭādhyāyī* accounts for all of *āmreḍita* groups that occur in *Ṛgveda* 1.1–1.50: *sūtras* 8.1.1–8.1.15 describe (or prescribe) their derivation and accent. For *Ṛgvedic* *āmreḍitas*, there is no difference in the treatment of reiterated theonyms and non-theonyms in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*: in both cases the required rules for their derivation and accent are accounted for. In comparison, in derivation of *dvandvas* there are quite a few features that Pāṇini does not account for although most rules required are given in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. For example, the rules for the order of constituents do not account for the variation in the order of constituents in two pairs of theonyms, such as in *uśāsanāktā / nāktośāsā* and *dyāvāpr̥thivī / pr̥thivīdyāvā*; the substitution prescribed for the final vowel of the first constituent (P 6.3.26) has at least one exception, i.e. *indravāyū* (possibly also *indrāgnī*) which is not notified by Pāṇini. Although

⁶ A *pada* is defined in P 1.4.14: *suptinantaṃ padam* “a *pada* is [that which] ends in *sup* [case-ending] or *tiṅ* [verb-ending]”; in nominal composition only *padas* with the case-endings are involved (P 4.1.1; 1.2.45; 1.2.46; 1.4.14).

⁷ Cardona (1996, 67) paraphrases this rule: “a syntactic item is repeated on condition that repetition of an action or pervasion of a thing by a property or an action is to be conveyed; e.g. *gr̥hé gr̥he* ‘in each and every house’, *pībāpiba* ‘drink again and again.’”

⁸ Cardona (1996, 67–72) shows that P 1.2.64 (*sarīpāṇāmakaśeṣa ekavibhaktau*) does not allow derivation of compounds having identical nominal bases.

derivational rules for *dvandva* compounds comprising non-theonyms are provided, the derivation of *mātārāpitārā*, commonly used as an epithet for Heaven and Earth, is not accounted for in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (Ditrich, 2009).

To summarise, Pāṇini does not treat *āmreḍita* word-groups as compounds; however, he does provide rules for doubling whole syntactic items without any distinction between reiterated theonyms and non-theonyms. This fact further supports the hypothesis being developed in this article, that iterated theonyms, expressing repetition of an activity, evolved later on, in analogy with reiterated non-theonyms and consequently — unlike *dvandva* compounds — they do not display any specific features, neither in the *R̥gvedapadapāṭha* nor in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

3. Typology and Development of *Āmreḍita* Compounds

In *āmreḍita* compounds (or word-groups) an inflected form is repeated, thus giving the group an intensive, distributive or iterative meaning. The prior component of this construction retains its own independent accent while the other component is not accented (e.g. *divé-dive* ‘every day’); however, when the constituents are in tmesi both retain their accents (e.g. RV 5.52.17 *saptá me saptá*).⁹ Several modern scholars classify them as a separate type, so-called iterative compounds; they define them as compounds that express iteration in time (e.g. *divé-dive* “every day”), distribution in space (*viśé-viśé* “in every house”), frequency and succession (e.g. *agním-agnim* “Agni again and again”; *yajñásya-yajñasya* “of every sacrifice”) or intensity (e.g. *dhiyā́-dhiyā́* “with increasingly repeated thought”) (Delbrück, 1900, pp. 141–142; Renou, 1952, pp. 123–124). Others classify *āmreḍita* word groups as a subtype of *dvandva* compounds and discuss them in the sections dealing with copulative compounds. (Elizarenkova, 1987, p. 235; Whitney 1964, p. 488). Wackernagel (1957, p. 147) treats *āmreḍita* groups in his grammar under the compound section although he says that they are not proper compounds; he believes that they may develop into proper compounds in three ways: by deletion of the case ending of the first constituent, by deletion of the case endings of both constituents, or by transformation of the *āmreḍita* into an adjective. Renou (1961, p. 121) thinks that it is rather difficult to draw a line between mere word repetition and a compound; he uses for *āmreḍitas* a term “faux composés” and classifies them as iterative compounds under a section titled “Composés Anormaux”. However, the treatment of *āmreḍita* word-groups as compounds is supported by the accentuation pattern as well as by the close relationship between *āmreḍitas* and *dvandvas* pointing to the same semantics of both types (e.g. *āmreḍita* group *divé-dive* “every day” and a *dvandva* compound *nakta-divam* “day and night”).

By far the most common *āmreḍita* compounds in the *R̥gveda* are formed from two substantives (e.g. *divé-dive* “day by day”). There are also several attestations of

⁹ P 8.1.3: *anudāttaṃ ca [āmreḍitam 2]*.

āmreḍita groups consisting of two pronouns (e.g. *tvám-tvam* “you and (again) you”), adjectives (e.g. *pányam-panyam ... sómam* “Soma who is again and again to be praised”), pronominal adjectives (e.g. *anyám-anyam* “one after another”) or adverbs (e.g. *púnar-punar* “again and again”), only a few occurrences of iterated numerals (e.g. *dvā-dvā* “two and two”), prepositions (e.g. *prá-pra* “further and further, ever more”) and one attestation of a repeated finite verb (*píba-piba* “drink again and again”) (Collitz, 1882, pp. 287–298; Wackernagel, 1957, pp. 143–146). *Āmreḍita* word-groups were originally in the singular but the plural meaning of the repetition led to the development of plural forms that occur already in the *Ṛgveda* (e.g. RV 5.52.17 *ékam-ekā śatā daduḥ* “they have given a hundred each”). The transition from iterative compounds to regular compounds started in the later Vedic language; e.g. from RV 8.68.14 *dvā-dvā* “two and two”, to Maitrāyaṇi Saṃhitā *dvan-dvám* “in pairs” and finally to Taittirīya Saṃhitā *dvandvā-* “pair” (Macdonell, 1910, p. 155).

Āmreḍita word groups identified in *Ṛgveda* 1.1–1.50 are as follows:

Nouns

1. *divédive*: “day by day”, has the largest number of attestations of all *āmreḍitas* in the *Ṛgveda* (47 attestations). The compound comprises two substantives in D. Sg., used with L. Sg. meaning. The nominal stem may be *diva* n. or *div* m.; however, it seems that the frequency of the locative ending *-e* of *-a* stems led to the usage of *-e* also for the consonant stem *div-* (Wackernagel, 1957, p. 146).
2. *dyávidyavi*: “day by day”; 2 attestations, two substantives in L. Sg.
3. *tuñjētuñje*: uncertain meaning; 1 attestation, two substantives in L. Sg.
4. *sutésute*: “in every libation”; 3 attestations, two substantives in L. Sg.
5. *agnímagnim*: “Agni again and again”; 3 attestations, two theonyms in A. Sg.
6. *viśéviše*: “in every house”; attestations, two substantives in D. Sg., used with L. Sg. meaning.
7. *yógeyoge*: “in every deed”; 1 attestation, two substantives in L. Sg.
8. *vájēvāje*: “in every attempt for price”; 4 attestations, two substantives in L. Sg.

Pronouns and Pronominal adjectives

1. *ékamekam*: “one by one”; 6 attestations, two numerals: in A. Sg. (1.20.7, 5.52.17, 8.70.14), in N. Sg. m. (3.29.15, 5.61.1), in N. Sg. f. (1.123.8).
2. *táttad*: “any”; 4 attestations, two pronouns: in A. Sg. n. used as adjectives (1.46.12, 1.155.4, 8.39.4, 10.23.5).

Verbal prepositions

1. *pārāparā*: “further and further away”; 1 attestation.
2. *prápra*: “forward and forward”; 12 attestations.

The distribution of these compounds in the ten *maṇḍalas* of the *Ṛgveda* may give some indication of the development of *āmreḍitas*, presuming the generally accepted relative chronology of the *Ṛgveda* which situates the family books (*maṇḍalas* 2–7) and *maṇḍala* 10 at opposite ends of the chronological spectrum, and evaluates the duration of the composition of the entire *Ṛgveda* up to seven hundred years (Witzel, 1997, pp. 257–345). The distribution of the *āmreḍita* compounds identified in *Ṛgveda* 1.1–1.50 in the ten *maṇḍalas* is as follows:

Table 1: Distribution of *āmreḍitas* in *Ṛgveda* 1.1–1.50

<i>maṇḍala</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	total
<i>divédive</i>	8	4	8	3	2	5	2	7	5	3	47
<i>dyávidyavi</i>	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
<i>tuñjētuñje</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<i>sutésute</i>	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
<i>agnímagnim</i>	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	3
<i>viśéviśe</i>	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5
<i>yógeyoge</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<i>vájevāje</i>	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
<i>ékamekam</i>	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	6
<i>táttad</i>	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4
<i>párāparā</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<i>prápra</i>	4	0	1	0	2	1	2	1	1	0	12

Only *divédive* occurs frequently enough to indicate its distribution: this *āmreḍita* compound is found more often in the family books than in the younger layers of the *Ṛgveda*, having the smallest number of attestations in the latest *maṇḍala* 10. It is evident from Table 1 that most frequently used iterative compounds are formed from two substantives (e.g. *divé-dive* “day by day”), usually occurring in the locative. This pattern of distribution does not support the hypothesis by Collitz (1882, pp. 287–298) that iteration of substantives is a later development but it seems that it may have developed at an early stage of the Indo-Aryan period. As noted before, theonyms rarely occur in *āmreḍita* compounds: apart from Agni who is attested in the sample investigated in this article, only one more deity is addressed in this construction, i.e. Indra. In the entire *Ṛgveda* they have only a few attestations: *agnímagnim* has three attestations (1.12.2, 6.15.6, 8.60.17) and *índramindram* only one (8.12.19), most of them occur in the middle chronological layer of the *Ṛgveda* and seem to express repetition of an activity; their pattern of distribution indicates that they may have developed in analogy with reiterated non-theonyms.

In comparison, the distribution of *dvandva* compounds in the ten *maṇḍalas* of the *Ṛgveda* does not reflect the relative chronology of the *Ṛgveda* which is widely

accepted by modern scholarship (Ditrich, 2006). *Dvandva* compounds in the *Rgveda* comprise almost entirely theonyms which occur throughout the text without any marked differences among the ten *maṇḍalas*. Names of deities that are addressed in pairs occur in a variety of coordinative nominal constructions (i.e. *dvandva* compounds, asyndeta, elliptic duals and syntagms constructed with coordinative particles) which follow specific paradigms. The specific distribution of theonyms reflects the Vedic ideas about the great significance and the magical power of divine names: they do not conform to the historical development of Ṛgvedic language, but follow special, well-established paradigms instead (Ditrich, 2007). On the other hand, the distribution of coordinative constructions comprising non-theonyms reflects the widely accepted relative chronology of the *Rgveda*; non-theonyms usually occur in a particular coordinative construction casually, with very few attestations, and seem to be more evenly distributed among the ten *maṇḍalas*. Research of *dvandva* compounds provides evidence that in an investigation of coordinative nominal constructions a distinction has to be made between theonyms and non-theonyms (Ditrich, 2006; 2007).

Consequently, it is evident that in the *Rgveda*, *dvandva* compounds comprise almost exclusively theonyms and that the rather closely related *āmreḍita* compounds consist nearly entirely of non-theonyms. The historical development of the two types is rather elusive and may be interrelated; both types seem to have Indo-European origins followed by specific developments at the Indo-Aryan stage. The so-called iterative compounds are attested in several Indo-European languages but only in Sanskrit can they be formed from any part of speech. Those consisting of two substantives seem to be of Indo-Iranian origin: apart from Sanskrit they occur only in Avestan: e.g. *nmānē-nmānē*, *vīsi-vīsi* “in every house, in every clan”. Repeated adjectives and adverbs are attested in Old Greek (e.g. *πλέον πλέον*) and Latin (e.g. *magis magis*), however, these groups seem to express mainly coordination and are not really iterative compounds (Delbrück, 1900, pp. 144–145). Pronouns are iterated in several Indo-European languages, i.e. in Avestan (e.g. *kañhe kañhe*), Old Greek (e.g. *τιςτις*), Latin (e.g. *quisquis*), Slavonic (e.g. Serb. *kàd-kad*). Numerals are iterated in Vedic and Old Greek but attestations in other Indo-European languages seem uncertain. Iteration of prepositions is known also in Old Greek (e.g. *προπρό*) but iteration of finite verbs occurs only in Sanskrit. Delbrück (1900, pp. 149–153) argues that iteration of pronouns, prepositions and numerals in distributive sense may be of Indo-European origin whereas the iteration of nouns developed in the Indo-Aryan period. Collitz (1882, pp. 287–298) believes in the Indo-European origin of iterative compounds but only of those that iterate pronouns, adverbs and verbal prepositions. More recently, Dressler and Dunkel revisited the Indo-European history of iterative compounds. Dressler (1968, pp. 39–46) focuses on iterative compounds of Vedic type *divé-dive*: he shows that the most common case for iteration of two substantives is the locative which he believes to be the oldest, of Indo-European origin. On the other hand, Dunkel (1981, pp. 214–231) argues that iteration had started in Indo-European with preverbs, then spread to other adverbs and later to nouns in adverbial function; only in Vedic was the process generalized to nouns in grammatical function (subject, direct object,

possessive genitive). The origin and development of *āmreḍita* groups seems uncertain; the only iterative compound ever ascribed to proto Indo-European is preverbal **própro* that can be reconstructed in Vedic Homeric and Latin and, as shown by Dunkel, also in Hittite which probably reflects the earliest stage of evolution of Indo-European iteration of preverbs (Dunkel, 1981, pp. 214–231).

In the *Ṛgveda*, as evidenced also on Table 1 above, most frequently used iterative compounds are formed from two substantives (e.g. *divé-dive* “day by day”), usually occurring in the locative which confirms Dressler’s (1968, pp. 39–46) argument. The diachronic analysis of *āmreḍita* word-groups examined in this article indicates that they all originate in the Indo-Aryan period. Although iterated nouns seem to be of Indo-Iranian origin (with a few attestations in Avestan), there is only one *Ṛgvedic* *āmreḍita* compound that has a parallel compound attested in Avestan, i.e. RV *viśé-viśe*, Av. *vīsi-vīsi*. Apart from Avestan, the *Ṛgvedic* *āmreḍitas* examined here have no attested parallels in any other Indo-European language. Similarly, the iterated pronouns (*táttad*, RV 1.46.12ab) and numerals (*ékamekam*, RV 1.20.7c) have no parallels in other Indo-European language groups. Of the two iterated verbal prepositions examined here, i.e. *pārāparā* (RV 1.38.6ab) and *práp̄ra* (RV 1.40.7cd), only *práp̄ra* has several parallel forms attested in Vedic, Homeric Greek and Latin and, as shown by Dunkel (1981, pp. 214–231), also in Hittite.

To summarise: the most frequently used iterative compounds in the *Ṛgveda* are formed from two nouns and, as shown above, seem to be of Indo-Iranian origin but have developed and became very productive only in the Indo-Aryan period. *Āmreḍita* groups comprising other parts of speech are rare and, though some scholars believe them to be of Indo-European origin, they have, apart from *práp̄ra*, no parallels in any other language group. Theonyms rarely occur in *āmreḍita* compounds: only two deities are addressed in this construction, Agni and Indra; these *āmreḍita* groups seem to express repetition of an activity and have developed later, well into the Indo-Aryan period, in analogy with reiterated non-theonyms.

There is certainly a strong link between *dvandva* compounds and *āmreḍita* word-groups. Salus (1963, pp. 551–554) developed a hypothesis that *dvandvas* originated from *āmreḍita* groups — from those which were distributive in nature and in which one of the two identical parts was replaced by a different word (e.g. *devamdevam* “the god and again the god” > **manuṣyadevam* “man and god”). Although semantically there seems to be, in Salus’s words, “not too great a leap” from one type to the other he does not provide sufficient evidence to support his hypothesis (Salus, 1963, p. 553). Most of the *āmreḍita* word groups examined in this article express repetition and distribution and indicate a semantic link with *dvandva* compounds. However, the examined material does not give any evidence for Salus’s hypothesis that *dvandvas* originate from *āmreḍita* groups — namely from those which were distributive in nature and in which one of the two identical parts was replaced by a different word: among the material examined here no *dvandva* compound occurs that would have one component also attested in an *āmreḍita* word group. The only exceptions are the two

theonyms, Agni and Indra which occur both in *āmreḍitas* (*agnímagnim* and *índramindram*) and in numerous *dvandvas*. However, as shown above, their rare occurrence, their distribution in the ten *maṇḍalas*, and their analysis in the *Ṛgvedapadapāṭha* indicate that they cannot represent an ancient link between iterative and *dvandva* compounds but rather to the contrary: iterative compounds comprised of theonyms seem to have developed later on, originating from analogy with *āmreḍita* word group comprised of non-theonyms as it has been argued in this article.

4. Conclusion

In this article all *āmreḍita* compounds attested in the first fifty hymns of the *Ṛgveda* were identified and their analysis in the *Ṛgvedapadapāṭha* and the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, examined and compared with *dvandva* compounds attested in those hymns. In the *Ṛgveda-padapāṭha*, all *āmreḍita* compounds are perceived as compounds i.e. the components are separated by *avagraha*, which suggests that in the *padapāṭha* a word is considered to be a compound as long as it has one accent although the first component may be in an inflected form. This principle applies for *āmreḍitas* but not for *dvandvas* which comprise mostly theonyms and follow different principles. Theonyms very rarely occur in *āmreḍita* compounds: only two deities are addressed in this construction, Agni and Indra, and these *āmreḍita* groups are always analysed in the *padapāṭha*.

Most rules required for derivation of *dvandvas* are given in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* although there are some features that Pāṇini does not account for. Unlike *dvandvas*, Pāṇini does not treat *āmreḍita* word-groups as compounds; however, he does provide rules for doubling whole syntactic items under various conditions. There is no difference in the treatment of reiterated theonyms and non-theonyms in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*; the required rules for their derivation and accent are accounted for. This fact supports the hypothesis that iterated theonyms, expressing repetition of an activity, developed later and are consequently rare in the *Ṛgveda* and—unlike *devatādvandvas*—do not display any specific features in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

Among *āmreḍita* word groups examined it is only *divédive* that occurs frequently enough to display its distribution: it occurs slightly more often in the family books than in the younger layers of the *Ṛgveda*, having the smallest number of attestations in the latest *maṇḍala* 10. The most frequently used iterative compounds in the *Ṛgveda* are formed from two nouns, usually in the locative. Most of the *āmreḍita* word groups examined express repetition and distribution and indicate a semantic link with *dvandva* compounds. The most frequently used iterative compounds in the *Ṛgveda* are formed from two nouns; they seem to be of Indo-Iranian origin but have developed and become very productive only in the Indo-Aryan period. *Āmreḍita* groups comprising other parts of speech are rare and, though some scholars believe them to be of Indo-European origin, they have, apart from *práp̄ra*, no parallels in any other language group.

It was been argued that all types of *dvandva* compounds and other coordinative constructions signifying dual theonyms display specific grammatical and stylistic features; the reason for this seems to lie in Vedic ideas about the magical power of divine names (Ditrich, 2009). In the light of this argument, it may be presumed that since *āmreḍita* compounds comprised of theonyms are extremely rare in the *Ṛgveda* — unlike *dvandvas* and other coordinative constructions consisting of theonyms and do not display any distinct feature, i.e. neither in the *Ṛgveda-padapāṭha* nor in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* nor in their distribution in the ten *maṇḍalas*, it seems that they developed later, well into the Indo-Aryan period, by analogy with reiterated non-theonyms. Due to their later development *āmreḍitas* comprising theonyms are rare in the *Ṛgveda*. It can be concluded that neither *dvandvas* nor *āmreḍitas* can be examined as single categories but a distinction has to be made between non-theonyms and theonyms.

Abbreviations

A.	accusative
D.	dative
Du.	dual
f.	feminine
G.	genitive
L.	locative
m.	masculine
n.	neuter
N.	nominative
P	Pāṇini's grammar, the <i>Aṣṭādhyāyī</i>
Pp	<i>Padapāṭha</i>
RV	<i>Ṛgveda</i>
Sg.	singular
Sp	<i>Samhitāpāṭha</i>
-	<i>avagraha</i>

References

- Bloomfield, L. (1963). *Language* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass).
- Cardona, G. (1996). “*Āmreḍita* compounds?” In *Veda-vyākaraṇa-vyākhyāna: Festschrift Paul Thieme zum 90. Geburtstag am 18. März 1995*, ed. by H. Schmidt and A. Wezler. *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 20. Reinbek: Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen, 67–72.
- Collitz, H. (1882). “Ueber eine besondere Art vedischer Composita.” *Verhandlungen des fünften internationalen Orientalisten-Congresses: gehalten zu Berlin im September 1881*, vol. II, 2. Berlin: A. Asher & Co. Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 287–298.
- Delbrück, B. (1893). *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Theil 3. Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen, by K. Brugmann and B. Delbrück. Band 3. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.

- Ditrich, T. (2009). “Chronological Relationship between the *Rgvedasamhitā*, the *Rgvedapadapāṭha*, and the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* Revisited”. Paper presented at the 14th World Sanskrit Conference, Kyoto University, Japan, 01–05 September 2009. [forthcoming]
- Ditrich, T. (2007). “Stylistic Analysis of Coordinative Nominal Constructions for Dual Deities in the *Rgveda*”. In *Proceedings of the 13th World Sanskrit Conference, Edinburgh, July 2006*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. [forthcoming]
- Ditrich, T. (2006). “*Dvandva* Compounds and the Chronology of the *Rgveda*”. *Crossroads* 1 (Autumn 2006), 26–35 (Website: <http://uq.edu.au/crossroads/>).
- Dressler, W. (1968). “Ved. *divé-dive* und die idg. Iterativkomposita.” In *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturkunde: Gedenkschrift für Wilhelm Brandenstein (1898–1967)*, ed. by M. Mayrhofer. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Band 14. Innsbruck: AMCE, 39–46.
- Dunkel, G. E. (1981). “*Āmṛeḍita* and iteration of preverbs in Vedic and Hittite.” *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung begründet von Adalbert Kuhn* 95, 214–231.
- Elizarenkova, T. IA. (1987). *Vediiskii iazyk*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Gonda, J. (1975). *Vedic Literature: Samhitās and Brāhmaṇas*. A History of Indian Literature, vol. I, fasc. 1. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Jha, V. N. (1992). *A Linguistic Analysis of the Rgveda-padapāṭha*. Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series No. 142, Pre-Pāṇinian Grammatical Traditions (Part 1). Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.
- Joshi, S. D. & Roodbergen, J. A. F. (eds., trans.). (1974). *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Bahuvrīhidvandvāhnika (P. 2.2.23–2.2.38)*, Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C, No. 9 (Poona: University of Poona).
- Joshi, S. D. & Roodbergen, J. A. F. (1993). *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini: With Translation and Explanatory Notes*, vol. 2 (1.2.1–1.2.73). New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.
- Macdonell, A. A. (1910). *Vedic Grammar*. Strassburg: Karl Trübner.
- Oldenberg, H. (1888). *Die Hymnen des Rīgveda*. Band I: Metrische und textgeschichtliche Prolegomena. Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz.
- Renou, L. (1952). *Grammaire de la langue védique*. Collection “Les langues du monde”, vol. 9. Paris: IAC.
- Renou, L. (1961). *Grammaire sanscrite*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Salus, P. H. (1963). “On the Origin of the *Dvandva*.” *Orbis* 12 (2), 551–554.
- Wackernagel, J. (1957). *Altindische Grammatik: Einleitung zur Wortlehre, Nominalkomposition*. Band II,1, 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Whitney, W. D. (1964). *Sanskrit Grammar*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Witzel, M. (1997). “The Development of the Vedic Canon and its Schools: The Social and Political Milieu.” In *Inside the Texts, Beyond the Texts*, ed. by Michael Witzel. Harvard Oriental Series, Opera Minora, vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University, 257–345.

