Veda Section, Paippalāda Panel, Abstract

The ETAD-YAD Construction in the Paippalada-Samhita of the Atharvaveda

Werner Knobl, Kyoto

The ETAD-YAD construction is extremely rare in the Rgveda. At most, a dozen examples can be found. Here, the subordinate YAD-clause has a non-restrictive function, whereas in the Rgvedic TAD--YAD and YAD--TAD (or similar) constructions, which are by far more frequent, it is usual for the YAD-clause to function restrictively.

Vedic Prose, on the other hand, is replete with sentences of the ETAD--YAD variety. Two sub-types need to be distinguished. One preserves the kind of construction that we know already from the RV, in which ETAD and YAD refer to the same nucleus, and are in grammatical agreement with it, unless YAD takes the form of the neuter singular yad and acts as conjunction.

In the other sub-type, ETAD and YAD are likewise co-referential, but now YAD has altogether lost its variability. That inflexible neutral form, quite different in character from the conjunction yad, may be called yad "fig'e".

ETAD--yad constructions of this second type are extremely well attested in Vedic Prose: In the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa alone, 118 examples are reported to occur. And it is safe to say that the total number of ETAD--yad occurrences in Vedic prose adds up to over one thousand.

Two questions will be addressed in this paper: 1. What caused or conditioned the YAD in the ETAD--YAD construction of the second kind to become "fig'e", while the ETAD continued to be flexible, agreeing in gender and number with its predicate? 2. When and where did the ETAD--yad variety first occur?

Our construction seems to have made its earliest appearance in Kāṇḍa Nine of the Paippalāda-Saṁhitā, at 9.21.1-12. The twelve ETAD--yad passages of this Atharvavedic prose text will be discussed in all their numerical oddity. Only after that detailed discussion shall I try to answer the question as to why and how the new construction, with its fixed and unattracted yad, is likely to have come about.