Rosemarie Lühr

Stressed and unstressed particles in Old Indic

The compatibility of Old Indic vái and ha leads to a revision of previous particle classifications, including the status of particles as second-position phenomena in Old Indic. For this purpose, the meaning of those Old Indic particles that appear stressed and unstressed is described, both in semantic and pragmatic aspects. On the one hand, there are focus sensitive operators, on the other hand discourse particles. While the focus particles also occur intra-sententially and may be moved together with their focus exponent to the left and therefore are no Wackernagel-particles, the discourse-relational particle ha is a true second-position particle. In combination, ha and vái have a fixed order representing scope relations between discourse structure and illocutionary force.

1 Research issue

Old Indic particles serve different purposes, nevertheless, they may be classed under two general heads: modality and connection (Speyer 1896: 310). When modal, they are expressive of emphasis, negation, interrogation, exclamation and the like, when connective they connect either whole sentences or parts of them. Another distinction is the separation into particles that can begin the sentence like átha ‘then’, ápi ‘also’, utá ‘and’ and particles that cannot. Three types of postpositive particles or enclitics are to be distinguished. While sentence-connective enclitics like ca ‘and’ or vá ‘or’ are attached to the first word of the constituent or clause being conjoined or disjoined, whether that is a single word or clause, word-level enclitics like the emphasizing particles cid, ñd have scope over a single word or constituent, and are placed directly behind this word or constituent. The so-called sentential enclitics like affirmative khálu, kila ‘indeed’, asseverative su, sí ‘well’ (referring to the verb) show the most word order variation. By referring to the statement of the whole sentence in a somehow expressive way some are placed after the first stressed word in a sentence
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and any emphatic or sentence-connective clitic associated with that word, others behind a particular syntactic position in the clause (Fortson 2004). Furthermore, one part of the postpositive particles is stressed, one part is not. In contrast to German where one and the same modal particle may be stressed or unstressed by displaying different functions, in Old Indic the prosodic structure is firmly attached to the particle, it is either stressed or unstressed. But as it appears in German, Old Indic likes putting together and even combining two or more particles. The particles at main issue in the following are the particles ha and vái. Their meaning is given as ‘indeed’ and ‘just’ respectively. Though further clarifications are necessary, the distribution of ha vái suggests that these particles are situated in two different syntactic positions in the structure of the left periphery.

It was Wackernagel’s Law (Wackernagel 1891/1892) which has made significant progress in exploring particles in Old Indic and beyond: weakly stressed and unstressed words, among others particles, clitizise onto stressed ones and hold the second sentence position, whereby the grammatical class of the preceding (stressed) element of the sentence is not fixed. However, in the second sentence position besides unstressed particles also the just mentioned stressed particles appear in Old Indo-European languages. This means, that in Old Indic both kinds of particles obviously seem to have consistent functional areas, and unstressed particles and stressed particles can be focus particles or discourse particles. In the following we stay with Old Indic, because this language is the first among the oldest Indo-European languages which have indications of word stress. In Old Indic as well as in German, focus particles mark the part of the sentence that contains the most important information while discourse particles can structure a discourse according to foreground and background information. This was the reason to separate the corresponding particles according foregrounding.

1 This is also true to Icelandic hvað-exclamatives: hvað following an integrated particle is pronounced [kvað], which is the unstressed counterpart of [‘khva:ð] (Jónsson 2010, 2017).
2 In German a discourse particle can also occur in the left periphery together with a focus particle (FP) and a DP:
   (i) Wohl nur FRITZ hat er getroffen.
      FRT only Fritz has he met
      ‘Fritz was probably the only one he met.’
      (Egg and Mursell 2017: Ex. [8]).
3 For a similar distribution of the left-peripheral sentence particles inu and ia, cf. Petrova (2017).
4 A recent work in which previous research approaches are summarized is Conglio (2009). Here, the conditions for modal particles in subordinate clauses are identified. For stressed modal particles in German, cf. Thurmair (1989: 104), Coniglio (2006, 2011: 9).
and backgrounding in Lühr (2009, 2010). It was assumed that by foregrounding particles the hearer’s attention is drawn to a certain fact. Compared with this, by using backgrounding particles the speaker makes clear that he moves certain text elements or knowledge requirements to the background. In the following the term “foregrounding particle” is used synonymously with “discourse-relational particle” for the particle is fulfilling discourse-organizational functions by relating items of discourse to other items of discourse (Diewald 2006: 406). As it will be shown, the discourse-relational particle *ha* has scope over the background particle *vāi*. And it is exactly this that is indicated by stress in Old Indic: The discourse-relational particle is unstressed and the backgrounding particle is stressed. But in Old Indic, also combinations of foregrounding and backgrounding particles appear in the Wackernagel position. To explain the pragmatic function of such combinations, it first will be shown that the usages of the various types of particles in the Wackernagel domain can clearly be separated from each other. Therefore, these particles have to be initially considered independently. The first section is about unstressed focus particles, the second about stressed focus particles, the third about the unstressed discourse-relational particle *ha*, the fourth about stressed backgrounding particles and the last about the combination of a discourse-relational particle and a backgrounding particle. The data come from our DFG-projects “Informationsstruktur in älteren indogermanischen Sprachen” and “Informationsstruktur in komplexen Sätzen – synchron und diachron”. They are available in the ANNIS database (Potsdam) (http://annis-tools.org) (Zeldes et al. 2009). However, to determine the discourse functions of the particles *ha* and *vāi* and their combination *ha vāi* especially records of one coherent text, the Cyavana legend, are used. As this legend consists of speeches and responses, real-life usage can be analyzed, as it is provided by Corpus Linguistics. There is no need to say that only by a comprehensive sampling of empirical data language hypotheses being developed for older language stages can be tested.

## 2 Focus particles

As mentioned (Section 1), in Old Indic focus particles have two prosodic representations, they appear unstressed and stressed.

### 2.1 Unstressed focus particles

Unstressed focus particles in the Wackernagel position in Old Indic will not be dealt with any further in the present investigation. According Mark Hale
(1987a, 1987b) (cf. also Hock 1996) such particles move into the second position by cliticizing onto a constituent that was topicalized to the first position. For example, in (1) áśmānaṃ cid as a whole could also have been placed in other positions, for example in the right edge of the sentence behind vācōbhiḥ.

(1) RV 4,16,67,8
áśmānaṃ cid yē bibhidūr
rock(M):acc.sg even who:nom.m.pl cleft:prf.ind.act3pl
vācōbhiḥ
word(N):instr.pl
‘who with their songs cleft even the mountain open’

Cf. with generalizing cid in the phrase anyātaś cid ‘even of everything else’ in the middle of the sentence:

(2) RV 1,4,5
utā bruvantu no nído nír
PFX say:prs.imp.act3pl our:gen critiziser(m):nom.pl PFX
anyātaś cid ārata
other:abl.sg even deprive oneself:aor.ind.act.2pl
‘Our critizisers may say: “You deprived yourself even of everything else.”’

The accentless and thus unstressed focus particle cid ‘even’ is a scalar focus particle assigning to its domain an extreme position on a scale formed by its

---

6 It is generally assumed that focus particles are focus sensitive operators binding parts of the utterance as their focus exponent (for association with focus, cf. Rooth [1985], and later for focus particles in German, cf. König [1991]).

7 The glossed sentence shows an analyzed sandhi, that is, with words separated free of contextual phonetic adaption. Examples of the Ṛgveda already discussed elsewhere are not glossed (Lühr 2004, 2009, 2010).

8 The following abbreviations are use in glossing examples: ABL = ablative, ACC = accusative, ACT = active, ADV = adverb, AOR = aorist, DU = dual, F = feminine, GEN = genitive, IMP = imperative, IND = indicative, INSTR = instrumental, M = masculine, MED = medium, N = neuter, NOM = nominative, PERIPHRAST = periphrastic, PRF = perfect, PFX = prefix, PL = plural, PRS = present, PRT = particle; QUOT = quotative, SG = singular, SBJV = subjunctive, VOC = vocative, 1/2/3 = 1st/2nd/3rd person.

9 A different notion is Bayer’s (2001) “emphatic topicalization”. It is a type of movement to the specifier of a dependent CP in Bavarian distinct from wh-movement. Once “emphatic topicalization” has applied to a CP, this CP itself is required to undergo topicalization. This movement induces a feature that is only interpretable in the domain of illocutionary force in the root clause.

10 Krisch (1990: 65) rightly points out that such particles are no Wackernagel enclitics for their position is depending on their host.
contextually relevant alternatives. These alternatives are contextually given or at least derivable.\textsuperscript{11} As is known, in Old Indo-European languages the first position of a sentence is a landing site for topicalized or contrastively focused material (Hale 1996: 169), namely, on the left of the landing site for \textit{wh}-movement, hence: Spec, TopP.\textsuperscript{12} Thus, (1) has the structure seen in (3), with \textit{cid} in Top\textsuperscript{0} following the first phonological word.\textsuperscript{13}
2.2 Stressed focus particles

Also the stressed particle *íd* ‘especially’ may appear behind the first phonological word of a sentence:

(4) RV 8,6,10

\[ ahám íd dhí pitúṣ pári medhám \]

\[ I:nom.sg \] especially for \[ father(M):gen.sg \] \[ PFX wisdom(F):acc.sg \]

\[ rtásya jagrābha \]

\[ truth(N):gen.sg \] have received:PRF.IND.ACT1SG

‘For I, especially, have received knowledge of the truth from my father.’\(^{14}\)

However, in Old Indic the sequence of a focalized word + *íd* is also not restricted to sentence-initial position:

(5) RV 10,91,3

\[ vásur vásūnāṃ kṣayasi \]

\[ God:nom.m.sg \] good things(N):gen.pl reign:PRS.IND.ACT2SG

\[ tvám éka \]

you:nom.sg alone:nom.m.sg completely heavens(M):nom.pl

\[ ca yáni pr̥thiví ca púṣyataḥ \]

and which:ACC.N.PL earth(F):nom.sg and produce:PRS.IND.ACT3DU

‘As God you completely alone reign on all good things, that heavens and earth produce.’

Also other stressed focus particles behave just as *íd*, for example *aṅgá* ‘just, alone’; hence, they occur in the Wackernagel position or within the sentence, namely always following the constituent which they emphasize:

(6) RV 10,4,4

\[ mūrā amūra ná vayám \]

\[ foolish:nom.m.pl \] wise:VOC.m.sg not we:nom.pl

\[ cikitvo mahitvám agne \]

\[ sagacious:VOC.m.sg \] grandeur(N):ACC.sg Agni:VOC.sg

\(^{14}\) *íd* is not a “free focus” in the sense of Féry (2012), in sentences as:

(i) \([\text{MARIA/}]_{\text{TOP}}\) hat \([\text{AUCH/}]_{\text{FOC}}\) Kuchen gegessen.

Maria has also cake eaten

‘Maria ate cake, too.’

*íd* does not appear in distance position, but only in contact position. Apart from that, the stressed element *auch* in the German example is not a focus, but *Maria* is in the scope domain of *auch* so that Maria is the focus.
tuvám aṅgá vitse
you:nom.sg alone understand:prf.ind.med2sg
‘We foolish, o wise and sagacious Agni, do not (understand) your grandeur.
You alone understand it.’

(7) RV 1,84,8
kadā mártam arādhásam padá
when mortal:acc.m.sg avaricious:acc.m.sg foot(m):instr.sg
kṣūmpam sphurat /
iva kadā naḥ
toadstool(m):acc.sg kick away:prs.ind.act3sg like when of us:gen.pl
śuśravad gīra índra aṅgá
will hear:prs.sbjv.act3sg songs(f):acc.pl Indra:nom.sg alone
‘When will he kick away with the foot the avaricious mortal like a toadstool,
when will he hear our songs, Indra alone?’
(Kozianka 2000: 224; for further details cf. Lühr 2010)

In German postposed stressed auch ‘also’ is comparable. Following the focus auch itself is stressed: cf. the additive focus particle auch in: auch PEter vs. Peter AUCH. In accordance with the phenomenon association with focus auch takes the preceding element in its scope domain.

3 Backgrounding particles

Moving on to the backgrounding particles in the Wackernagel position, further stressed particles in this position, we choose the particles hí and vái from these particles, because they have a similar function. They resemble German modal particles15 for expressing a speaker’s attitude toward an utterance. The particle hí is often found in motivating requests. Here, the hí-sentence acts as a subsidiary speech act (Lühr 2004). The request is the more reasonable the more convincing the motivation. Such a motivation then includes frequently the modal particle ja in the German translation:

(8) RV 5,77,1
prātaryávānā prathamá yajadhvam
at early morning-coming:acc.m.du first worship:prs.imp.med2pl

---

15 Modal particles are partly treated as weak adverbs (Coniglio 2011), partly as functional heads (Struckmeier 2009, 2014; Bayer and Obenauer 2011), or more specified as pre-VP functional heads (Bayer 2012), cf. further Jónsson (2017).
‘First worship those who come at early morning. In the morning the Aśvins receive their sacrifice.’

(German: Am Morgen empfangen ja die Aśvins ihr Opfer.)


German ja marks the proposition as uncontroversial (Jacobs 1991). The proposition must not to be immediately pre-mentioned. Rather, ja triggers the presupposition, that the proposition represents a content which is generally accepted, this is customs, beliefs, conventions, obviousnesses; cf. the discussion on vái. In (11) below, something which has just been recognized is communicated; hence it is not contextually given information, but information which is evident to all discourse participants. An appropriate translation for a particle which makes background information explicit as part of the common ground is bekanntlich ‘obviously’ or ‘as is known’. But as in English many means functioning as lexical markers of common grounds exist (Fischer 2007), in the following English translations of the whole sentences the equivalents of the German modal particles sometimes remain untranslated.

Also in motivating statements hi is documented in the sense of German ja:

(9) RV 7,21,6

ná te vivyañ mahimánam
not of you:gen.sg comprehend:prs.ind.act3sg greatness(m):acc.sg
rájámsi / svéná hi vṛtráṃ
region(n):nom.pl own:instr.n.sg obviously Vṛtra(m):acc.sg
śávasā jaghántha
power(n):instr.sg slay:prf.ind.act2sg

‘the regions do not comprehend your [of Indra] greatness. With your own power you slew Vṛtra.’

(German: Mit deiner eigenen Kraft hast du ja den Vṛtra erschlagen.)

As explained in Lühr (2009), by employing the particle hi, the speaker assumes that the fact set out is present to the hearer. But he or she mentions it explicitly to be sure that it is really known to him (Thurmair 1989: 105). However, marking of a
proposition as KNOWN may also have the purpose, “die entsprechende Information beim Hörer [...] im Hintergrund zu belassen; durch ja wird dann dem Hörer bedeutet, dem dargestellten Sachverhalt – eben weil er bekannt ist – nicht die volle Aufmerksamkeit zu widmen“ [to leave the relevant information in the background; by using ja it is then indicated to the hearer that his attention should not be fully focused on the fact presented, precisely because it is known] (Thurmair 1989: 106; translation R.L.).

However, while hi does not always appear in the second sentence position, Vedic vái behaves differently: According to Delbrück (1888: 22) vái belongs to those particles, „welche der Stelle hinter dem ersten Worte des Satzes zustreben und damit die Fähigkeit erlangen, den Satzgedanken hervorzuheben“ [which tend onto the place behind the first word of a sentence acquiring the ability to gravitate toward the idea of the sentence; translation R.L.]. For that, we regard the evidence of the Sanskrit legend around Cyavana in the Šatapatha-Brahmaṇa (ŠB IV 1,5) talking about the rejuvenation of an old man. In this legend vái has functions which can be assigned to a superior feature KNOWN as in the case of hi. The first sentence of the Cyavana legend is:

(10) Cyavana, ŠB IV 1,5,1
\[
yátra \textit{vái} bhṛ̥gavaḥ \textit{vā} \textit{āṅgirasah} \textit{vā} \\
\text{when as is known Bhr̥gus(m):nom.pl or Angiras(m):nom.pl or} \\
svargám lokám samáśnavata \\
\text{heaven(m):acc.sg world(m):acc.sg reach:prf.ind.act3pl} \\
tát cyávanaḥ [... ] jīrṇih \\
\text{then Cyavana(m):nom.sg decrepit:nom.m.sg} \\
kṛtyárūpah jahe \\
\text{in the shape of a ghost:nom.m.sg stay behind:prf.ind.act3sg} \\
\text{‘when, as is known, the Bhr̥gus and the Angiras reached the heaven, the world, then Cyavana stayed behind decrepit looking like a ghost ...’} \\
\]

The use of vái in the beginning of a narration is typical for this type of prose (Speyer 1896: 70). The temporal clause functions as a frame setting adverbial. The story of the Bhr̥ghus’ and Angiras’ trip to the world is assumed to be known. Thus, vái is a speech act modifier, the host sentence of which is already part of the common ground. This sentence refers to background information.

Another usage appears in different copular structures.18 (11) is a specificational sentence (Mikkelsen 2005: 122). It is preceded by the following: Śaryāta Mānava belonging to the same clan as Cyavana happened to be in the area, when

18 For the distinction between the different kinds of copular clauses cf. Mikkelsen (2005), Geist (2006, 2007).
boys pelted the old man with clods. At this moment he recognized his relative and exclaims:

(11) Cyavana, ŚB IV 1,5,5

\[
\begin{align*}
sá & \quad \text{vaí} & \quad \text{cyávanaḥ} & \quad \text{iti} \\
& \quad \text{he:nom.m.sg} & \quad \text{obviously} & \quad \text{Cyavana(m):nom.sg} & \quad \text{QUOT} \\
& \quad \text{‘This is Cyavana.’} \\
& \quad \text{(German: Das ist ja der Cyavana.)}
\end{align*}
\]

The exclamation Das ist ja der Cyavana ‘This is Cyavana’ is uncontroversial, but is made salient nevertheless because it is significant to what is actually happening, here in the at-issue dimension of the utterance (cf. for this use of German ja, Viesel [2017]).

Not only in exclamatory, but also in affirmative clauses this use is often documented; cf. for an example in an unaccented text, that is, without accent diacritics on stressed vowels. An equative clause is (12):

(12) BAU III.1.25

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vāk} & \quad \text{vaí} & \quad \text{yajñasya} & \quad \text{hotā} \\
& \quad \text{speech(F):nom.sg} & \quad \text{obviously} & \quad \text{sacrifice(m):gen.sg} & \quad \text{Hotar(m):nom.sg} \\
& \quad \text{‘The speech is known to be the Hotar of the sacrifice’} \\
& \quad \text{(German: Die Rede ist ja der Hotar des Opfers)}
\end{align*}
\]

Again in a predicative structure with identifying reference in the following the Aśvins say of themselves:

(13) Cyavana, ŚB IV 1,5,15

\[
\begin{align*}
múkhyaú & \quad \text{vaí} & \quad \text{āvám} & \quad \text{yajñasya} \\
& \quad \text{supervisor(m):nom.du} & \quad \text{obviously} & \quad \text{we:nom.du} & \quad \text{sacrifice(m):gen.sg} \\
svaḥ & \quad \text{yaú} & \quad \text{adhvaryú} \\
& \quad \text{be:prs.ind.act1du} & \quad \text{who:nom.m.du} & \quad \text{Adhvaryu(m):nom.du} \\
& \quad \text{‘We as the Adhvaryus are the two supervisors of the sacrifice.’} \\
& \quad \text{(German: Wir, als die Adhvaryaus, sind ja die beiden Vorsteher des Opfers.)}
\end{align*}
\]

Adjectives are to be found in predicational clauses: In the Cyavana legend, pretty Sukanyā – the name means ‘pretty girl’ – decidedly rejects an unambiguous proposal of the two Aśvins. She should leave her old husband Cyavana and come with them. She says:

(14) Cyavana, ŚB IV 1,5,10f.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ná} & \quad \text{vaí} & \quad \text{súsarvau} & \quad \text{iva} & \quad \text{sthaḥ} \\
& \quad \text{not} & \quad \text{obviously} & \quad \text{complete:nom.m.du} & \quad \text{as it were} & \quad \text{be:prs.ind.act2du}
\end{align*}
\]

19 The Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣat is one of the oldest Upanishads.
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nā sūsamṛḍdhau iva
not perfect:NOM.M.DU as it were
‘You both are obviously somehow not complete, somehow not perfect.’
(German: Ihr beide seid ja irgendwie nicht ganz vollständig, irgendwie nicht ganz vollkommen.)

Even if the Aśvins do not know what is meant by these words, Sukanyā knows. Speaker knowledge is also expressed when the Aśvins incite the gods to invite them to the sacrifice. The gods have refused this, because the Aśvins acted as doctors among men for too long. The Aśvins then speak the following sentence being incomprehensible for the gods:

(15) Cyavana, ŚB IV 1,5,14
vīśīrṣṇā vai yajñēna
headless:INSTR.M.SG obviously sacrifice(m):INSTR.SG
yajadhve iti
sacrifice:PRS.IND.MED2PL QUOT
‘You make a headless sacrifice.’
(German: Ihr opfert ja ein kopfloses Opfer.)

It follows, that the feature KNOWN of vai in (10) to (15) has different connotations: In (10) the speakers indicate that the proposition in their opinion is also known to the hearer. On the contrary, (11) is an emphatic statement. The speaker expresses his surprise that the fact he is stating ‘This is Cyavana’ (German: Das ist ja Cyavana) is correct. The situation providing the reason for the statement of the speaker is also accessible to the hearers (Thurmair 1989: 107). This also applies for the affirmative clauses (12) and (13). Opposite to this, in (14) and (15) the speaker assumes that he or she has access to knowledge of which the hearer is not aware. For the Aśvins as well as the gods put an understanding question in both cases: ‘Why are we not complete, not perfect?’ respectively ‘Why with a headless [sacrifice]?’ Therefore, (14) and (15) show that besides the expression of background information the particle vai has a further relevant function determining the course of conversation. Affirmative clauses with vai can initiate questions of clarification, these are special speech acts.

Whereas in a declarative sentence the speaker knows the truth of the proposition, in an interrogative sentence it is the addressee who can evaluate the truth of the proposition. The speech act relation simply mediates between the discourse participants of speaker and hearer, and the seat of knowledge invoked in the sentence. Therefore, these two speech acts can be represented as differing in their assignment of the seat of knowledge to the participants in the discourse (represented by underlining the appropriate person) (cf. Tenny and Speas 2004):

(16) declarative:  [Speaker, Hearer]
interrogative:   [Speaker, Hearer]
As questions are formed to ask for missing information which is known to the addressee also in these cases the feature KNOWN comes into play and all ways of use of the backgrounding particle vái can be subsumed under this feature.

4 Discourse-relational particle

Passing now to a discourse-relational particles that is unstressed we choose the particle ha, for it appears in the combination ha vái (Section 5). With ha a change of the discourse situation is suggested.20 Eleven of eighteen sentences in the Cyavana legend contain a verb of saying, whereby the change of perspective concerns persons. The sentences are declarative sentences ensuring the extension of the narrative. The sentence type (17) with a subject in the first position is often documented, cf. with an anaphoric pronoun:

(17) Cyavana, ŚB IV 1,5,5 (cf. ŚB IV 1,5,7; 9; 10; 11 with 3sg; ŚB IV 1,5,5; 15 with 3pl; ŚB IV 1,5,9; 11; 12; 13; 14 with 3du; ŚB IV 1,5,9 with an anaphoric pronoun in the accusative)

\[ sā \; ha \; uvāca \]

he:nom.m.sg but say:prf.ind.act3sg

‘But he said:’

Similar is (18), which is preceded by a speech of Sukanyā. The two Aśvins establish a speaker change:

(18) Cyavana, ŚB IV 1,5,10

\[ ōm \; ha \; etād \; evā \; ūcatuḥ \]

he:acc.f.sg but that:acc.n.sg exactly say:prf.ind.act3du

‘But they said exactly that to her.’

Also in the following passage a change of perspective is designated. Sukanyā had previously refused the proposal of the Aśvins by saying: ‘I will not desert, while he lives, the man to whom my father gave me.’ Her words will now be followed by a sentence with a cognitive verb:

(19) Cyavana, ŚB IV 1,5,9

\[ tād \; ha \; ayām \; īśih \; ājayau \]

this:acc.n.sg but this:nom.m.sg R̥ṣi(m):nom.sg notice:prf.ind.act3sg

‘But this R̥ṣi noticed that.’

A local change of perspective is expressed by verbs of movement like ‘to set off’:

(20) Cyavana, ŚB IV 1,5,7
sā  ha  tátaḥ  evā  śáryātaḥ
he:nom.m.sg but then so Śaryāta(m):nom.sg
mānavāḥ  údyuyuje
descendant of Manu:nom.m.sg set off:prf.med.ind3sg
‘But then Śaryāta, the descendant of Manu, set off.’

By a declarative sentence containing the particle ha also circumstances opposite to the previous ones, so to say a complete change in the situation, are denoted, as in the following sentence. Cyavana created dissent in the clan of Śaryāta Mānava, because boys had insulted him (cf. the context of [11]). Śaryāta Mānava apologized for it and married his daughter Sukanyā to him. Then it is said:

(21) Cyavana, ŚB IV 1,5,7
tásya  ha  tátaḥ  evā  grāmah  sāṃjajñe
he:gen.m.sg but then so clan(m):nom.sg get along:prf.ind.med3sg
‘But then the clan got along’

Thus, first dissent, then reconciliation. With that, all occurrences of the particle ha in the Cyavana legend have been discussed and it may be concluded: When an addressee hears an utterance with ha, he or she must be prepared that the narration takes another direction than previously assumed, either by speaker change or by a change of the locality or even by the advent of an incongruent situation. Thus, ha is an adversative particle which signals that the addressee has to be prepared for a contrast. Its discourse function is denial of expectation (Lakoff 1971).

5 Particle combination

The particle combination to be discussed consists of the discourse-relational particle ha and the backgrounding particle vāi in the Wackernagel position. The word order is always ha vāi.

The first sentence of the Cyavana legend ‘For when the Bhr̥gus and the Angiras reached the heaven …’ (10) is followed by the all-focused clause:

(22) Cyavana, ŚB IV 1,5,2
śáryātaḥ  ha  vāi  idām  mānavāḥ
Śaryāta(m):nom.sg but as is known there descendant of Manu:nom.m.sg
grāmeṇa  cacāra
clan(m):instr.sg go around:prf.ind.act3sg
‘But Śaryāta, the descendant of Manu, went around there … with his clan (as is known).’
The question is whether the discourse functions identified for the particles *ha* and *vái* when taken alone fit together here. With *ha* again a change of perspective in personnel matters is notified. Before, a talk of the Bṛṛgus and the Angiras and now of Śaryāta, the descendant of Manu, was represented. By contrast, *vái* has the semantic feature KNOWN. Consequently, it is presumed that the hearer not only has knowledge of the Bṛṛgus’ and Angiras’ trip to the world, but also, as it is said in the second clause (22), that he or she knows, that Śaryāta was in that region present, where the Bṛṛgus and the Angiras arrived.

The constellation of these actors is not otherwise documented in the Indic literature. However, it is reasonable to suppose that it was known. In any case, the connection between the Bṛṛgus and Angiras is old. In the Ṛgveda book 8 the progenitor of the Bṛṛgus, Bṛṛgu, is mentioned together with the progenitor Angiras. Angiras is one of the seven wise men, several hymns have been dedicated to him.

(23) RV 8,43,13 For Agni

> utā tvā bhṛṛguvāc chuce manuśvād agna āhuta |
> āngirasvād dhavāmahe

‘And we invoke you like Bṛṛgu, o pure, like Manus, Aṅgiras, o Agni, o sprinkled with ghee’

(cf. Geldner 1951)

In another place in the Ṛgveda also Śaryāta appears, in a hymn to Indra:

(24) RV 1,51,12 For Indra

> â smā ráthaṃ vr̥ṣapāneṣu tiṣṭhasi śāryātásya prābhṛtā yēṣu māndase

‘You mount on the car amid the bull draughts: (the Soma draughts of) Śāryāta are offered in which you intoxicate yourself’

(cf. Geldner 1951)

The reason why the particles *ha* ‘but’ and *vái* ‘as is known’ (German: *ja, bekanntlich*) are combinable is due to the fact that the feature UNEXPECTED of *ha* ‘but’ refers to the situation expressed in the sentence in which *vái* occurs. By this feature the facts achieve a different perspective. Compared to this, in (22) *vái* points to knowledge levels being equally established in the consciousness of speaker and addressee.

The particle combination *ha vái* is again found in Vedic unaccented texts:

(25) Chand.UP 1.11.20

> sarvāṇi ha vai imāni bhūtāni

all:NOM.N.PL but as is known this:NOM.N.PL living being(N): NOM.PL

> prāṇam eva abhi saṃviśanti

vital breath(M): ACC.SG just through enter:PRS.IND.ACT3PL

‘But all these living beings just enter through the vital breath (as is known)’
Let us now consider additional records with the combination *ha vái* in Old Indic:

(26) Cyavana, ŚB IV 1,5,8

\[
\text{aśvīnau} \quad \text{*ha} \quad \text{vái} \quad \text{idám} \quad \text{bhīṣajyāntau}
\]

Aśvīn(M):nom.du but as is known here acting as doctor(M):nom.du

ceratuḥ

wander about:prf.ind.act3du

‘But the two Aśvins … acting as doctors wandered about here’

While *ha* indicates a change of perspective again, here with regard to person and situation, the exact reference of the backgrounding particle *vái* has to be proved. The sentence contains two predications, the finite verb *ceratuḥ* ‘they wandered about’ and the participle present *bhīṣajyāntau* ‘acting as doctors’. In this context it is important that in the Ṛgveda the Cyavana legend is mentioned and is thus in any case known to the hearers:

(27) RV 1,116,10

\[
\text{jujrūṣo nāsatyotā vavrīm prāmuṇcaṭaṃ drāpīm iva cyāvānāt} |
\text{prātirataṃ jahitāsyāyur dasrād īt pātim akṛṇutāṃ kanīnām}
\]

‘And, you Nāsatyas [Aśvins], took away sheath from the aged Cyavāna as if it had been a cloth. You Dasras, extended the life of him who had been cast off and you made him the husband of young women’

Furthermore, in the Indic tradition the Aśvins are presented as divine doctors and helpers healing the sick and helping the poor and distressed in need and danger (Bechert 1984: 43). These are therefore stable and generally known characteristics of the Aśvins, i.e. individual-level predicates. It seems therefore obvious to relate the backgrounding particle *vái* to *bhīṣajyāntau* ‘acting as doctors’. A possible German translation of (26) would be construed with a relative as in (28).

(28) *Die beiden Aśvins aber, die bekanntlich als Ärzte wirken, zogen hier umher.*

Thus, the reference of *vái* is apparent from the context. The particle cannot be attached to the constituent it actually modifies, namely *bhīṣajyāntau* ‘acting as doctors’, because *vái* only appears in the Wackernagel position.

Finally, the following record with the particle connection *ha vái* has to be discussed – for the moment *vái* remains untranslated.

(29) Cyavana, ŚB IV 1,5,4

\[
\text{śāryātāḥ} \quad \text{*ha} \quad \text{vai} \quad \text{iṅsāṃ} \quad \text{cakre}
\]

Śāryāta(M):nom.sg but ? think:periphrast.prf make:prf.med.ind3sg

‘But Śaryāta ... thought’
The sentence recalls (19), repeated here for convenience as (30), it is also associated with a verb of perception, but without vái:

(30) Cyavana, ŚB IV 1,5,9
   tád dhāyām21 īṣīr ājajñau
   ‘But this Ṛṣi noticed that.’

In (19)/(30) as well as in (29) a change of perspective is expressed by ha like in several other text passages. However, in respect to (29) not only the preceding context has to be considered, but also the following. In the previous sentence the situation is described resulting from the humiliation of Cyavana – boys pelted the old man with clods. Cyavana took revenge by creating dissent among the clan:

(31) Cyavana, ŚB IV 1,5,3
   pitaivā putrēṇa yuyudhe bhṛātā bhṛātrā
   ‘Even the father quarreled with the son, the brother with the brother’

However, only the following context provides the explanation for the use of the particle vái. Śaryāta is surprised at the dissent between father and son and brother and brother. His thought is rendered as in (32):

(32) Cyavana, ŚB IV 1,5,4
   yāt kīm ākaram tásmā
   which:acc.n.sg what:acc.n.sg do:aor.ind.act1sg this:abl.n.sg
   idām āpadi iti
   here get into:aor.ind.med1sg QUOT
   ‘What did I do that I got into this?’
   (lit.: ‘Which, what did I do?, therefore I got into here’)

Rendering the meaning of vái with ‘obviously’, thus, the whole text passage amounts to (33):

(33) ‘But Śaryāta obviously thought: “What did I do that I got into this?”’

The function of vái is then clear. In his commentary, the narrator tries to guess what Śaryāta may have thought in the described conflict situation. That is to say, vái expresses the narrator’s attitude toward the utterance. He or she is convinced that his/her interpretation is correct. Therefore, an epistemic meaning can be attributed to vái, given that this would mean that epistemicity qualifies the knowledge the speaker has about the possibility, probability or certainty of the proposition expressed by his or her utterance.

21 Here, Sandhi is not resolved.
In (34), the meaning of the particle vái is different:

(34) RV 8,58,2
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{ékaḥ} & \text{evá} & \text{agnir} & \text{bahudhā} & \text{sámiddha} \\
\text{one:nom.m.sg} & \text{only} & \text{fire(m):nom.sg} & \text{many times} & \text{kindle:nom.m.sg} \\
\text{ékaḥ} & \text{súryo} & \text{viśvam} & \text{ánu} & \text{prabhútaḥ} \\
\text{one:nom.m.sg} & \text{sun(m):nom.sg} & \text{all:acc.n.sg} & \text{pxf} & \text{penetrate:nom.m.sg} \\
\text{ékā} & \text{evá} & \text{úśāḥ} & \text{sárvam} \\
\text{one:nom.f.sg} & \text{only} & \text{dawn(f):nom.sg} & \text{all:acc.n.sg} \\
idáṃ & \text{ví} & \text{bháty} \\
\text{this:acc.n.sg} & \text{pxf} & \text{shine on: prs.ind.act.3sg} \\
ékaṃ & \text{vái} & \text{idáṃ} & \text{ví} & \text{babhúva} \\
\text{one:nom.n.sg} & \text{obviously} & \text{this:acc.n.sg} & \text{pxf} & \text{emerge:pf.ind.act.3sg} \\
sárvam & \text{all: acc.n.sg} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Only one fire is kindled many times, only one sun is all penetrating, dawns as one shine on all this, from this one, unfolds the whole.’

(cf. Geldner 1951)22

Compared with (32), the factual circumstances of the vái-utterance are related to utterances previously mentioned. They can be discovered from these. Therefore, vái displays an evidential meaning (Thurmair 1989: 120) rather than an epistemic one. However, the relationship between evidentiality and epistemicity is a matter of debate. The following distinction is made by de Haan (2005: 379): “Evidentiality asserts the evidence, while epistemic modality evaluates the evidence.” Whatever it may be, there is agreement that evidentiality and epistemicity are concerned with the speaker’s attitude to the truth-value or factual status of the proposition. This is why Palmer (2001: 24) speaks of “propositional modality”.

Looking for parallels for an emphasized affirmative particle behind a discourse-relational particle and hence for clausal scope in nowadays languages, cf. Abraham’s (2017) German example (with MP = modal particle):23

(35) Er heißt Philomena, hat \textit{aber doch/ *doch aber} Hosen an.
\texttt{his name is Ph., has MP1 MP2 \textbf{MP2 MP1 pants on}}
\texttt{(Abraham 2017: Ex. [64])}

22 According to Speyer (1896: 70), vái stresses the most important and most general of four parallel sentences.

And for the combination of aber ‘but’ and ja ‘obviously’ in New High German, we also find records for that:

(36) *Magdalena Neuner war immer ein Vorbild für mich, aber die ist ja nicht mehr dabei.*

‘Magdalena Neuner was always a good example for me, but she is no longer there.’


(37) „*Aber er hat ja gar nichts an!*“ sagte endlich ein kleines Kind.

‘But he has nothing on at all,” said a little child at least.’

(http://gutenberg.spiegel.de/buch/hans-christian-andersen-m-1227/114)

(38) *Wenn die EZB nun aber „offensichtlich“ Zinsaufschläge auf Staatsanleihen einzelner Staaten neutralisieren will ...*

‘But if the EZB evidently intends to neutralize the spreads above government bonds of individual states’

(http://www.openeuropeberlin.de/omt-politisch-bequem-okonomisch-nutzlich-aber-rechtlich-unhaltbar-von-michael-wohlgemuth/)

(39) *Es muss noch mehr Computer gegeben haben, die aber „offensichtlich“ zuvor entfernt“ wurden. Wusste Edathy also von den Ermittlungen?*

‘There must have been more computers but which were evidently removed before. Hence, did Edathy know about the inquiries?’

(*Tagesspiegel*, 14.2.2014)

As with German aber ... ja/offensichtlich, in the Old Indic particle sequence *ha vái* the discourse-relational particle has scope over the backgrounding particle (cf. for German, Diewald [2007]).

Because there is a relation between the syntactic order and the order in which things get interpreted, Dik’s (1997: 399) “Principle of Iconic Ordering” may be seen working here.

(40) Constituents conform to GP1 [Principle of Iconic Ordering] when their ordering in one way or another iconically reflects the semantic content of the expression in which they occur.

However, the order of the discourse-relational particle in front of the backgrounding particle can also be derived from scope relations.
6 Conclusion

The particles in the second sentence position in Old Indic are partly stressed, partly unstressed. Firstly, focus particles have stressed and unstressed representations. The focus particles associate with their focus exponents inside the sentence forming a clitic complex and might be moved with their host to the left. Only after topicalization of their hosts the unstressed and stressed focus particles get into the Wackernagel position. As shown in (3), movement into the specifier position of a functional head takes place. In any case the focus particles constantly follow a phonological word while assigning a special focus accent to it.

The situation is different with the discourse particles discussed. The particles *ha* and *vāi* always occur in the Wackernagel position, hence they are true Wackernagel particles. Of these, *ha* is a signal for a change of perspective. It is a discourse-relational or foregrounding particle. Compared to it, the backgrounding particle *vāi* expresses the speaker’s attitude to an addressee-based as well as to self-directed stock of knowledge and assumptions. *vāi* has evidential and epistemic features, whereby the meanings of *vāi* represent the speaker’s position to the truth-value or factual status of the proposition. The discussed discourse particles *ha* and *vāi* are combinable. In combination, only the word order *ha vāi* can be found. The fixed order may be iconic, mapping scope dominance of discourse structuring over illocutionary force, or it results from scope relations being associated with these particles. In the first place the discourse-relational particle *ha* appears. The backgrounding particle *vāi* follows, signaling that the proposition is uncontroversial: the anchoring of the utterance in the discourse has scope over the presupposition that the content is undisputed. Hence, *ha* and *vāi* are manifestations of distinct levels of discourse.\(^\text{24}\)

Using Delbrück’s (1888) term *Satzgedanke*, two different ideas of the sentence are expressed by *ha* and *vāi*, a discourse-relational strategy and the speaker’s attitude towards the proposition in the background of speech.

---

\(^{24}\) The semantic contribution of the particle cluster is compositionally derivable from the meaning of the respective particles.
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