SSL

On *āmreḍitas* in Sanskrit: evidence from Vedic Prose

Beatrice Grieco

Abstract

This paper aims to provide some preliminary findings on the so-called *āmreḍita* compounds by considering evidence from Vedic Prose, here represented by the *Brāhmaṇas*. So far studies have focused on *āmreḍitas* in the *Ṛgveda*, while a systematic investigation of those in the later Vedic Prose language has not been undertaken yet. Vedic Prose exhibits the emergence of new forms, almost entirely absent in earlier texts but taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. I will focus on verbal *āmreḍitas*, in particular on those formed with imperatives and gerunds. According to the Indian grammarians, verbal *āmreḍitas* encode the same values as the intensive category, i.e., *kriyāsamabhihāra* "repetitious or intense action" and *nitya* (= *abhīkṣṇya*) "reiteration". The equivalence in meaning between repeated verbal forms and intensive verbs – already identified by Pāṇini and his commentators (cf. *Kāśikā ad* A 3.4.2; *Kāśikā ad* A 8.1.4) – explains why verbal *āmreḍitas* are present in Vedic Prose. Indeed, I will show that the first cases of verbal *āmreḍitas* are found in Vedic Prose when the intensive category was recessive.

Keywords: Vedic Sanskrit, *āmreḍitas*, intensive category, verbal repetition.

1. Introduction

This paper aims to provide some preliminary findings on the so-called *āmreḍita* compounds in Vedic Prose by considering evidence from the *Brāhmaṇas*, chronologically later than the *Ṛgveda* (RV; around 2nd millennium BCE). So far, studies have focused on *āmreḍitas* in the *Ṛgveda* (see Collitz, 1882; Dressler, 1968; Dunkel, 1981a; 1981b for preverbs; Klein, 2003; Ditrich, 2011), while a systematic investigation of those in the later Vedic Prose language has not been undertaken yet.

Before analyzing the data collected in Vedic Prose, Section 2 discusses some relevant features of *āmreḍitas*, including an overview of the Indian grammatical tradition; then, Section 3 outlines the corpus to examine the diachronic behavior of these forms from the earliest attestations to the Late Vedic period. After describing the corpus, Section 4 includes several observations about the Ṛgvedic Sanskrit data, following Klein (2003). Klein observes that *āmreḍitas* are most nominal compounds, whereas there are almost no verbal compounds. The near absence of verbal *āmreḍitas* in Ṛgvedic Sanskrit is explained by their functional overlap with the intensive category, i.e., a verbal category particularly productive in Early Vedic which shows morphological reduplication and iterative meaning.

Based on this observation, I intend to further substantiate Klein's intuition that verbal *āmreḍitas* and intensives are functionally equivalent, while also taking the Indian grammatical tradition into account. In particular, in Section 5, I will show that verbal *āmreḍitas* become more common in Vedic Prose, while intensives become rare formations. Section 6 proposes a possible historical scenario to account for the use of verbal *āmreḍitas* in Vedic Prose, claiming that these constructions constitute one of the strategies to replace the intensive category, which became recessive after Ṛgvedic Sanskrit. Section 7 concludes the article.

2. *Defining* āmreḍitas

The so-called *āmreḍita* compounds consist in the repetition of two identical inflected words under a single accent in order to encode a wide range of values, including: intensity (*sáṃ-saṃ* "all together" RV 10.191.1a), iterativity (*púnaḥ-punar* "again and again" RV 3.5.7d), *singulatim* repetition or distribution (*éka-eka* "one by one" RV 3.29.15c), universality (*jánaṃ-janam* "every man" RV 6.15.4a) and indefiniteness (*yád-yad* "whatsoever" RV 8.61.6c).

These forms are also called reduplicative compounds or *āmreḍita* word-groups (Ditrich, 2011) and are particularly productive in Vedic

(291 tokens in the *Ṛgveda*, 318 in Late Vedic, according to my esti-
mate, see *infra*, § 5), whereas they are marginally attested in other an-
cient Indo-European languages, such as Avestan (Wackernagel, 1957:
146)[1], Classical Armenian (Jensen, 1959), Hittite (Yates, 2014) and
Mycenaean Greek (Meissner and Tribulato, 2002: 316; Tribulato,
2015: 67).

Like other compounds in Sanskrit, in the *Ṛgvedapadapāṭha*
"Ṛgveda-word-text" (c. 900 BCE) these forms are treated in a spe-
cific manner. The *Ṛgvedapadapāṭha* separates all the words of the
Ṛgvedasaṃhitāpāṭha and it undoes *sandhi* rules: in the case of com-
pounds, their members are separated by the *avagraha* (transliterated
with a short hyphen).

Moreover, *āmreḍitas* share with compounds another significant
feature, that is the position of the accent. These repeated forms have
a single accent on the first member, even though both its members are
inflected, unlike in compounds.

For this reason, modern grammars regard *āmreḍitas* as com-
pounds, but with some differences between them. Whitney (1889:
488) considers *āmreḍitas* a subclass of *dvandva* compounds, assum-
ing that «though these are not properly copulative compounds, there
is no better connection in which to notice them than here»; accord-
ing to Whitney (1889: 488), these forms occur in all stages of the
language giving an intensive, distributive, or repetitional meaning.
Delbrück (1888: 51) devotes five pages to *āmreḍitas*, describing them
at the very beginning of the paragraph *Gruppen im Satze* and includ-
ing relevant data from the Late Vedic period. Other grammars, such
as Wackernagel (1957: 143), albeit including *āmreḍitas* among com-
pounds, add that they are not considered compounds in the Indian
grammatical tradition. For this reason, in the next section I will con-
sider the approach to *āmreḍitas* taken in the main Indian grammar,
Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

---

[1]   Reduplicative compounds become more common in the Middle Iranian languages
(cf. SALEMANN, 1930: 66 in Pahlavi; GERSHEVITCH, 1961: 633-634 in Sogdian; DEGE-
NER, 1987 in Khotanese).

2.1. Āmreḍitas *in Pāṇini*

Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A) is the earliest and most fundamental Sanskrit grammar. Although establishing an absolute chronology is difficult, if not impossible, it is generally assumed that this grammar is dated to approximately the 4th century BCE. More importantly, according to several studies (see, e.g., Bronkhorst, 1982: 275-276, 279; Whitney, 1893), the language that Pāṇini described in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* mostly reflects the language attested in the Vedic prose corpus, in particular in the *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa*.

As mentioned in the previous section, in Pāṇini's grammar the constructions at issue are not considered compounds (*samāsas*), but as the repetition of two identical words (*dvirvacana*). More specifically, the term *āmreḍita* (from the root *ā-mreḍ-* "repeat") refers to the second repeated word which is *anudātta* "lacking pitch" (cf. A 8.1.1-8.1.3)[2].

Potential reasons for their exclusion from the compound group have been provided by several scholars (cf. Joshi and Roodbergen, 1974; Cardona, 1996), but it has not yet been completely explained. For instance, according to Joshi and Roodbergen, one reason may be that *āmreḍitas* lack the elision of case endings, since they are formed with two inflected words. Further, Cardona notes that the rule A 1.2.64 (*sarūpāṇām ekaśeṣa ekavibhaktau* "only one remains from among those which have the same form and which occur before the same *vibhakti*") excludes *āmreḍitas* from compounds[3].

Regarding *āmreḍita*'s meaning, Pāṇini's rule *nityavīpsayoḥ* (A 8.1.4) specifies that *āmreḍitas* specifically encode two major values. The first is *nitya* "constant repetition", which is explained as *abhīkṣṇya*

---

[2] Cf. *sarvasya dve* (A 8.1.1); *tasya param āmreḍitam* (A 8.1.2); *anudāttaṃ ca* (A 8.1.3).

[3] Nonetheless, the difference between compounds and *āmreḍitas* is subtle even in Pāṇini, considering that some *āmreḍitas* are treated like a *bahuvrīhi* or a *karmadhāraya* compound. Indeed, rules that affect *bahuvrīhis*, such as the elision of case suffixes (*sublopa*) are applied even to *āmreḍitas* in A 8.1.9: e.g., when *ekam* is repeated, it is treated like a member of a *bahuvrīhi* compound, that is *ekaikam*. In A 8.1.11, the repetitions taught in rules 8.1.12-15 are treated like *karmadhāraya* compounds, likewise effecting the elision of case suffixes, but also triggering *pumvadbhāva* "masculine transformation" and the assignment of the accent to the last syllable (cf. SHARMA, 2003: 420).

"reiteration" and is considered to relate to the quality of an action (*kriyādharmaḥ*) in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV). The second value is *vīpsā* "distribution" which is, conversely, found in nouns (*supsu vīpsā*)[4].

The repetition of one set of forms expresses some minor values. Specifically, the repetition of *pari* expresses *varjana* "exclusion" (A 8.1.5), as in *paripari trigarttebhyo vṛṣṭo devaḥ* "god rained all over, but not in the country of the Trigarttas" (tr. Sharma, 2003: 414). Some adpositions such as *upari*, *adhi* and *adhas* encode *sāmīpya* "proximity" (A 8.1.7) and repeated adjectives *prakāra* "a sort of" (A 8.1.12), etc. (see *infra*, § 5).

To summarise, in this paper I refer to *āmreḍitas* as compounds, following Western grammarians of Sanskrit and the most recent studies, even though this is not the label used in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. However, in the following analysis I will take Pāṇini's grammar and the writings of his commentators into account when defining the meaning of some specific *āmreḍitas* attested in my corpus, in particular the verbal ones, which generally express *nitya* "reiteration".

3. *Corpus*

In order to carry out a sufficiently accurate diachronic analysis of the data, the corpus used in the present research includes the *Ṛgveda* for the earliest stage of the language and some Vedic prose texts for a later stage.

The *Ṛgveda* is the main and most ancient metrical text (± 2nd millennium BCE) of the Indo-Iranian language family. It is composed of 10 books, and about 10,600 verses for a total of approximately 200,000 words: the first part of book 1 and book 10 of the *Ṛgveda* are the most recent parts (see, most recently, Hellwig, Scarlata and Widmer, 2021), whereas the so-called 'family books' (2-7) were composed during an older stage. All cases presented here are quoted from the *Ṛgvedapadapāṭha*.

---

[4]   These explanations are found in KV *ad* A 8.1.4. For the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, I used the edition of Sʜᴀsᴛʀɪ and Sʜᴜᴋʟᴀ (1965-1967).

The Vedic Prose corpus is extremely vast and consists of both chronologically and thematically differentiated texts (see Lowe, 2017: 57-58 for an exhaustive survey). I have selected the *Brāhmaṇas* (BR), prose explanations of Vedic ritual and Vedic texts used during ritual performance, probably composed between 10th-7th century (Gonda, 1975: 360). In particular, two *Brāhmaṇas* have been analysed, namely the *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* (AB), which belongs to the *Ṛgveda* and runs to approximately 50,000 words, and the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* of the *Śukla Yajurveda* (ŚB), specifically the *Mādhyaṃdina* recension which is approximately 160,000 words.

Some examples from the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* (MS) of the *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda* and from the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* (GB) are included where relevant. For the sake of comparison and in order to show the diachronic development in the later Epic Sanskrit language, this research makes use of some examples from the *Mahābhārata* (MBh.)[5].

4.   Āmreḍitas *in Ṛgvedic Sanskrit*

According to Klein (2003), in the *Ṛgveda* there are 291 tokens of 131 *āmreḍita* types, as illustrated in Table 1:

Nouns (Adjectives)	Adverbs	Pronouns	Preverbs	Numerals	Verbs
207	18	33	20	11	2

Table 1. *Tokens of* āmreḍitas *in the RV.*

---

5   For the present investigation, the *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* and the first seven books of the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* have been completely examined, while the remaining seven books of the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* have been investigated cursorily. The *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* is quoted following the *bhāṣika* accentuation system (see Cardona, 1993). I have selected the *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* and the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* since these texts have been well studied in the Western tradition and they have been completely translated. The data have been collected from the *Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien* (TITUS, Gippert, *et al*. 2016), and from the *Digital Corpus of Sanskrit* (DCS, Hellwig, 2010-2021). The translations of the *Brāhmaṇas* are based on Keith (1920) for AB, Eggeling (1882-1900) for ŚB, Patyal (1969) for GB. The translations from the *Mahābhārata* are mine.

The components of these compounds are mostly nouns and adjectives (including participles), whereas some forms are completely unattested or very scarcely attested.

Among nominals, there are no instances of vocative *āmreḍitas*. In this respect, the only occurrence of a repeated and juxtaposed vocative – even if it cannot be considered a proper compound – comes from last section of the *R̥gveda*, the section considered to be the most recent.

(1) áraṇyāni áraṇyāni *asaú yā́ prá iva nā́śyasi*
     kathā́ grā́mam ná pr̥chasi
     "*Araṇyānī, Araṇyānī*, thou there who dost, as it were, disappear, how is it that thou do not ask about the village?"
     (RV 10.146.1ac; Klein, 2003: 794)

According to Klein (2003), in (1) the vocative form *áraṇyāni* is repeated to emphasise the fear of a man who is insistently calling on the Lady of the Desert for protection.

Turning to the verbs, there is just one instance of verbal *āmreḍitas*, the imperative *píbā-piba* (*ít*), lit. "drink, drink" (RV 2.11.11a = 10.22.15a), here (2):

(2) píbā-piba *ít indra śū́ra sómam*
     "*Drink, drink! / Drink over and over* the soma, o hero Indra."
     (RV 2.11.11a = 10.22.15a; Klein, 2003: 792)

The presence of an imperative form makes this passage ambiguous between two equally possible interpretations.

Firstly, as in (1), this form may be repeated to express emphasis ("drink, drink!") and the poet's purpose is simply to incentivise someone to drink the soma as soon as possible.

Secondly, another reading may be "drink over and over!" and the construction may encode iterative aspect. By Klein's own admission, for (2) the decision is totally arbitrary. Even though Sāyaṇa's commentary on RV 2.11.11 recognises an emphatic purpose, which is *ādarārthā*, i.e., has the sense of (or conveys) *ādara* ("care", "concern", "attentiveness") and similarly for *píbā-piba* in 10.22.15a, which is explained as

atitvarāpradarśanārtham ("for the purpose of showing the sense of great hurry"), he proposes a different solution[6]. Indeed, in his collection of data, Klein notes one further case of a juxtaposed imperative which exhibits no difference from (2), except that the *R̥gvedapadapāṭha* transmitted *stuhí stuhi* (*ít*) without using the *avagraha*:

(3) stuhí stuhi *ít eté gha te máṃhiṣṭhāsaḥ maghónām*
      "*Praise, praise!* These are indeed the most liberal of the liberal ones to thee."
                                          (RV 8.1.30ab; Klein, 2003: 793)

The decision of the bards to deliberately transmit *píbā-piba* with the *avagraha* in the *padapāṭha* text, and not *stuhí stuhi*, may be the proof that we are dealing with two different repeated constructions. It is possible, according to Klein, that in Vedic there exist a fine line between simple doubling, here (1) and (3), and proper *āmreḍitas*, here (2), and it may lie in the functions respectively encoded. Repeated vocatives express emphasis, but do not generally encode iterativity: «[...] a call to an individual is not to be understood as iterative ("O X over and over / O X and again X"); and this is probably the reason that the vocative is the one case that is not represented among nominal *āmreḍitas*» (Klein, 2003: 784). Similarly, repeated imperatives have more of an emphatic than an iterative value: they are often doubled to urge someone to do something, such as to praise (cf. ex. 3).

As a consequence, vocative and imperative *āmreḍitas* are extremely rare because «where the formal iteration is associated primarily with affective value» (i.e., emphasis) – Klein (2003: 794) says – «an *āmreḍita* is not likely to occur», since an *āmreḍita* is primarily used to express iterativity and distribution, and it is an iconic but not an emphatic formation (Klein, 2003: 794). For this reason, the *āmreḍita píbā-piba* signaled with the hyphen is likely to convey more than just an emphatic purpose[7].

---

[6] Cf. also Jamison and Brereton's translation of this passage: "Drink and drink the soma, o Indra, our champion" (Jamison and Brereton, 2014: 414).

[7] Nonetheless, Lubotsky (1997) adds *stuhí stuhi* to the group of *āmreḍita* compounds. With regard to its meaning, Sāyaṇa's commentary on RV 8.1.30ab considers *stuhí stuhi* as expressing iterativity (*punaḥ punaḥ*) and not emphasis. Jamison and Brereton (2014: 1024) opt, however, for an emphatic translation.

In a nutshell, it seems that the *āmreḍita píbā-piba* needs to be interpreted as "drink over and over!" and its 'compound form' functionally distinguishes it from other simply doubled constructions, such as *áraṇyāni áraṇyāni* or *stuhí stuhi*, without the *avagraha*.

But there is also a second, more significant, fact in favor of an iterative meaning for the *āmreḍita píbā-piba*: *pā-* does not possess an intensive formation[8]. To quote Klein (2003: 793), «it is therefore no accident that neither *pā* "drink" nor *stu* "praise", the only verbs forming actual or putative *āmreḍitas* in the Rigveda, form intensives in the Vedic language».

In fact, the most important question arising from the data collected by Klein is why Ṛgvedic Sanskrit basically lacks verbal *āmreḍitas*, except for *píbā-piba*. Klein states that the near-absence of *āmreḍitas* in Ṛgvedic Sanskrit can be explained considering that its verbal system already possesses the intensive category, formally reduplicated and with iterative/intensive *Aktionsart* (cf. int. *nonu-* "repeatedly shout" vs *nu-* "shout").

In other words, the main reason for the absence of verbal *āmreḍitas* is the possible functional overlap between these, which express iterativity (*nitya*), and intensives[9]. As Schaefer (1994) demonstrates, Vedic intensives encode iterativity more often than intensiveness, and in Pāṇini's grammar the notion *kriyāsamabhihāra* "repetitious or intense action" (A 3.1.22; A 3.4.2) includes the functions assigned to intensives and those assigned to repeated verbal forms (see *infra*, § 6)[10].

It is probably no coincidence that in the *Ṛgveda* nominal *āmreḍitas* are frequently combined with intensive verbs in a kind of 'complementary set' in which the iterative notion expressed by the intensive verb

---

[8] An intensive formation (*pepīyate*) is attested in a later period, e.g., *Upaniṣads* and *Harivaṃśa* (see WHITNEY, 1885).

[9] According to KLEIN (2003: 777, fn. 15), another reason may be to avoid complicated sequences formed with trisyllabic or even quadrisyllabic words. Indeed, in the *Ṛgveda*, Klein counts only 12 trisyllabic *āmreḍitas* (two-thirds in the latest books).

[10] OZONO (2018: 259) proposes that *kriyāsamabhihāra* refers to verbal plurality in a broader sense: «das intensivstammbildende Suffix *ya* (*yaÑ*) hat eine grundsätzliche Funktion, welche Wiederholung einer Handlung bzw. verbale Pluralität (*kriyāsamabhihāra-*) bezeichnet».

is contextually reinforced by the nominal *āmreḍita* (cf. Klein, 2003: 786). See, for instance, (4-5)[11]:

(4) *marmr̥jyánte* divé-dive
     "They keep grooming *day after day*."   (RV 4.15.6c)

(5) *vayám indra tvé sácā vayám tvā abhí nonumaḥ*
     asmā́n-asmān *ít út ava*
     "We are together with thee, O Indra; we repeatedly shout unto thee.
     Aid *us alone always*!"   (RV 4.32.4; Klein, 2003: 786)

5.   Āmreḍitas *in Vedic Prose*

In Vedic Prose we find a different situation. According to my collection, there are 318 tokens of *āmreḍitas* formed with different parts of speech: the components of these compounds belong mainly to nominals (e.g., *kármaṇi-karmaṇi* "in every performance" ŚB 6.3.2.4), pronominals (e.g., *tat-tad* "this, this" AB 1.4.5) and numerals (e.g., *dáśa-daśa* "ten, ten" ŚB 8.1.1.2), but, most of all, 13 cases show a verbal formation, including absolutes (or gerunds).

Table 2 gives a schematic representation of the different parts of speech that form *āmreḍitas* in Vedic Prose[12]:

Nouns (Adjectives)	Adverbs	Pronouns	Preverbs	Numerals	Verbs (Absolutives)
187	25	59	6	28	13

Table 2. *Tokens of* āmreḍitas *in the BR*.

Upon closer examination, among nominals, vocative *āmreḍitas* are not completely unattested. In comparison with what was stated

[11] Other examples of intensives combined with nominal *āmreḍitas* are RV 1.131.5, 181.4; 2.25.1 (=21b); 3.53.8; 4.15.6; 6.36.5; 8.55.4; 91.2 (Klein, 2003: 792).

[12] The occurrences (318 tokens) listed in Table 2 include those found in the *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* and the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* (books 1-7), while the data from the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* and the *Mahābhārata* have not been counted.

in § 4 – where the vocative *áraṇyāni* is doubled but this form cannot be considered an *āmreḍita* compound since both its elements are accented – in Vedic Prose we find the first unambiguous case of a vocative *āmreḍita*. This comes from the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* (6):

(6)   pátni patny *eṣá te lokás*
      "*Wife, wife*, this is your place."   (MS 1.4.3 = MS 1.4.8)

A less certain example is attested in the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*. Consider (7), where the construction is followed by the particle *iti* and the accentual ground is consequently quite problematic, since the accent may be on the second *janakaḥ* as well as on the particle.

(7)   [...] janakó janaka *íti vai jánā dhāvanti íti*
      "[...] *Janaka, Janaka*, in this way people rush [to me]."   (ŚB 14.5.1.1b)[13]

Moreover, the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* contains a significant passage in this respect. Here, there are three different invocations, but this text has been transmitted without accentuation (8):

(8)   *taṃ vāg anvavadat*
      vāyo vāya *iti*
      sa nyavartata sa dakṣiṇāṃ diśam aijata
      taṃ vāg anvavadat
      mātariśvan mātariśvann *iti*
      sa nyavartata sa pratīcīṃ diśam aijata
      taṃ vāg anvavadat
      pavamāna pavamāna *iti*
      "Speech resounded to him '*Vāyu Vāyu*'. He returned, (and) he moved towards the southern direction. Speech resounded to him '*Mātariśvan Mātariśvan*'. He returned, (and) he moved towards the northern direction. Speech resounded to him '*Pavamāna Pavamāna*'."
                                                              (GB 1.1.4.ck)

----

[13]   The case in (7) is not a vocative, but a nominative (*janakaḥ*): the same passage occurs in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 2.1.1 and is translated by HUME (1921): "verily people will run hither, crying, a Janaka, a Janaka". Therefore, it seems a possible case of *nominativus pro vocativo*.

Wackernagel (1957: 144) mentions another example in the later *Upaniṣads*: *ho ho ayi bhallākṣa bhallākṣa* "Hey, you short-sided one!" (Ch.Up. 4.1.2; Wackernagel, 1957: 144)[14]. This feature was probably quite common in Sanskrit. In A 8.1.8, Pāṇini actually prescribes the use of repeated vocatives (*āmantrita*) at the beginning of a sentence to express affective values, such as jealousy (*asūyā*), admiration (*sammati*), anger (*kopa*), scorn (*kutsana*) or menace (*bhartsana*)[15].

But vocative *āmreḍitas* are not the only innovation of the Late Vedic period. Hock (1993) discusses some forms absent in R̥gvedic Sanskrit but treated in Pāṇini's grammar, such as repeated adpositions with 'exclusive function' and repeated adjectives with 'attenuated function' (in Hock's terminology).

Specifically, rule A 8.1.7 teaches the use of certain repeated adpositions such as *upari*, *adhi* and *adhas*: *uparyadhyadhasaḥ sāmīpye* "two come in place of one whole form of *upari*, *adhi*, *adhas*, when *sāmīpya* 'proximity' is the signification" (tr. Sharma, 2003: 415). This means that repeated adpositions do not convey the intensive meaning "really over" or "really under" – as expected – but they encode what Pāṇini describes as *sāmīpya* "proximity". The 'proximity', considered an 'exclusive meaning' by Hock, is attested in several cases from the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*: *upari* and *adhas* are more commonly found repeated to express this function, while *adhi* seems absent. See the following example, already noted by Delbrück (1888: 55):

---

[14] Wackernagel (1957: 144) adds some other (later) cases of vocative *āmreḍitas*, such as KV *ad* A 8.1.8 *caura-caurā* "thief, thief!".

[15] The rule is *vākyāder āmantritasya asūyāsammatikopakutsanabhartsaneṣu* "Two come of an *āmantrita* (vocative) which occurs at the beginning of a sentence, provided the sentence is used with the signification of *asūyā* 'fault-finding', *sammati* 'praise, concurrence', *kopa* 'anger', *kutsana* 'censure' or *bhartsana* 'threat to harm, scolding'" (A 8.1.8; tr. Sharma, 2003: 416). But see also A 8.2.103 *svaritam āmreḍite 'sūyā-sammati-kopa-kutsaneṣu* "a *pluta* vowel, marked with *svarita*, comes in place of the *ṭi* of a preceding *pada* when a *pada* termed *āmreḍita* follows and *asūyā* 'fault-finding', *sammati* 'assent, praise', *kopa* 'anger' and *kutsana* 'blame, censure' is denoted" (tr. Sharma, 2003: 596). According to this rule, in the case of repeated *āmantritas*, the ending vowel of the first component becomes a *pluta* vowel, marked with *svarita* accent when *asūyā*, *sammati*, *kopa* and *kutsana* are denoted.

(9) *atha dákṣiṇām bhrúvam* upáryupari *laláṭam úpaspṛśati*
     "He then touches with it his forehead *close over* the right eyebrow."
                                                              (ŚB 3.2.1.29b)
     "Dann berührt er die Stirn *gerade über* der rechten Braue."
                                                         (tr. Delbrück, 1888: 55)

Turning now to repeated adjectives, Pāṇini's rule A 8.1.12 treats adjectival *āmreḍitas* expressing an 'attenuated' meaning: *prakāre guṇavacanasya* "[iteration] of an adjective in the meaning of sorts" (tr. Hock, 1993: 177); a classical example included in KV *ad* A 8.1.12 to explain this rule is *paṭupaṭuḥ* "a kind of clever (person)"[16]. According to Hock, this meaning may be found relatively early in Sanskrit, as in some passages from the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* such as *tásmin yā́vān vā yāvān vā rásaḥ sám asravat* "into it, just so much juice flowed" (ŚB 4.4.3.4; tr. Hock, 1993: 177). In fact, also Eggeling notes that the form *yā́vān vā yāvān vā* in ŚB 4.4.3.4 expresses «some indeterminate quantity of the juice» (Eggeling, 1882-1900: 371, fn. 3)[17].

It is clear that the values and the forms of *āmreḍita* constructions show increased productivity throughout Vedic Prose. But in this respect – as Table 2 above shows – the most crucial difference from the Early Vedic period is the presence of verbal *āmreḍitas*, in particular those formed with absolutes. Thus, in the next paragraphs I will focus on verbal *āmreḍitas*, while also taking the Indian grammatical tradition into account.

5.1. *Verbal* āmreḍitas

According to Klein (2003), the existence of a synthetic category that already has iterative *Aktionsart* explains why the *Ṛgveda* does not attest verbal *āmreḍitas*, except for roots lacking the intensive formation such as √*pā*. Indeed, the intensive is the only morphological category in Early Vedic which clearly displays iterative *Aktionsart* and the *Ṛgveda* has its highest frequency (almost 400 attestations), but it be-

---

[16] Crosslinguistically, the 'attenuation' has some parallels in expressions such as English *so so*, Italian *così così* etc. (cf. Hᴏᴄᴋ, 1993: 177).

[17] Another attestation of *yā́vān vā yāvān vā* is ŚB 4.4.5.13.

comes increasingly obsolete after Ṛgvedic Sanskrit[18]. To quote Whitney (1889):

intensives in the later language are very rare, so rare that it is hard to tell precisely what value is to be given to the rules of the native grammar respecting them. Nor are they at all common earlier, except (comparatively) in the RV., which contains about six sevenths of the whole number (rather over a hundred) quotable from *Veda* and *Brāhmaṇa* and *Sūtra*-texts; AV. has less than half as many as RV., and many of them in RV. passages; from the later language are quotable about twenty of these, and about forty more, but for the most part only in an occurrence or two.

<div align="right">(Whitney, 1889: 363)</div>

The later texts attest very few cases of intensives (twenty or forty according to Whitney). Considering that most of them come from Ṛgvedic quotations, the existence of a functional overlap between intensives and verbal *āmreḍitas* is no longer plausible in Vedic Prose. On the contrary, here I find cases of *āmreḍitas* formed with finite verbal forms (§ 5.1.1) and absolutives (§ 5.1.2).

5.1.1. *Finite verbal* āmreḍitas

As we have seen, the imperative *píbā-piba* (*ít*) "drink, drink!" (or "drink over and over!") is the only verbal *āmreḍita* attested in the *Ṛgveda*. In Vedic prose, *āmreḍitas* formed with imperatives are more frequently found (5 cases). See, for instance, (10-11):

---

[18]   There are also other two possible categories for which an iterative meaning is, however, more questionable. The III class of presents in Sanskrit (reduplicated presents) is semantically not as clear as the intensive and many possible interpretations have been proposed (see GIANNAKIS, 1997: 11-20; KULIKOV, 2005; LAZZERONI, 2011; GARCÍA RAMÓN, 2014; LAZZERONI and MAGNI, 2020). Some reduplicated presents such as *dádhāti* < √*dā* "give" or *dádhāti* < √*dhā* "put" are surely not iterative. A different case is where a class of verb shows two variants, one of which is formally reduplicated (these are the so-called 'polymorphic presents'): in this case, a semantic opposition is generally assumed, as in the doublet *bhárati* "brings" vs *bíbharti* "carries", *hánti* "kills" vs *jíghnate* "strikes repeatedly", *nasate* "approaches, returns" vs *nímsate* (3pl.mid.) "touch (closely)". JAMISON (1983b: 185) concludes that it is not possible to demonstrate an iterative/intensive meaning for the *-áya-* formations since «the evidence to prove or diprove it is too elusive to allow a definite judgement to be made about the value».

(10) yájasva-yajasva *íti sá hovā́ca* yájasva-yajasva *íti vā́vá tváṃ mā́m áttha*
    "'*Offer sacrifice! Offer sacrifice! / Offer sacrifice again and again*'. He spa-
    ke, verily, thou sayest to me: '*Offer sacrifice! Offer sacrifice! / Offer sacri-
    fice again and again*'."   (ŚB 12.3.4.1b)

(11) [...] *adhvaryúr evằha samídho yajéti* yája-yaja *íti caturthé-caturthe prayājé*
    samānáyamānau navábhiḥ prayājaíś carataḥ
    "[...] the Adhvaryu says (to the Hotṛ): 'Pronounce the offering-prayer
    on the kindling-sticks! *Pronounce the offering-prayer! Pronounce the of-
    fering-prayer! / Pronounce the offering-prayer continually*'. Pouring (the
    butter in the spoons) together at the fourth, they both proceed with the
    nine fore-offerings."   (ŚB 2.5.2.30)[19]

In my view, all cases here presented can have a twofold interpre-
tation: emphasis ("sacrifice! sacrifice!") as well as iterativity ("sacrifice
continually!") and, again, it is difficult to discard one interpretation
over the other.

On the one hand, the emphatic usage of repeated imperatives
seems more reasonable because it is a very common linguistic feature
(cf. Stoltz *et al.*, 2011, who consider the repetition of imperatives to be
induced by emotional involvement)[20]; and also because even the single
verbal *āmreḍita* from the *Ṛgveda* (*píbā-piba*) may not necessarily en-
code iterativity, as per Jamison and Brereton's translation and Sāyaṇa's
commentary. Moreover, emphasis expressed by repeated imperatives
is very productive at all stages of the Sanskrit language, where these
forms can be commonly found juxtaposed. See example (12) from the
Mahābhārata:

(12) [...] *saṃkruddhas* tiṣṭha tiṣṭha *iti cābravīt*
    "[...] and in great wrath said, '*Wait, wait*'."   (MBh. 6.43.28)

---

[19] Other occurrences of *āmreḍitas* formed with imperatives are ŚB 1.5.3.8b; 2.5.2.30;
14.6.7.5b; JB 2.213.
[20] «In the same vein, the inclusion of so-called "vocatives" and "imperatives" is in great
part misleading (Pott, 1862: 47-51) because in most of the reported cases the reduplication
might turn out to be induced by emotional involvement and might not be a requirement of
the grammatical structure of the language» (Stoltz *et al.*, 2011: 81).

On the other hand, Pāṇini (A 3.4.2) teaches a repetitive form of imperative such as *lunīhi-lunīhi* "cut, cut", which represents *kriyāsamabhihāra* ("repeated or excessive action"). Of course, this rule does not explicitly mention the doubling of the form, but this requirement is taught in KV *ad* A 8.1.12 (*kriyāsamabhihāre dve bhavataḥ* "the repetition occurs when repeated or excessive action is denoted"), which lists explanatory rules about the use of repetition[21]. See rule A 3.4.2 below:

(13) kriyāsamabhihāre *loṭ loṭo hisvau vā ca tadhvamoḥ*

"(Affix) *LOṬ* (imperative mood) (occurs after a verbal root) when *repeated or excessive action* is denoted; this *LOṬ* is replaced with *hi* and *sva* obligatorily, and with *ta* and *dhvam* optionally."

(A 3.4.2; tr. Sharma, 2002: 589)

As regards other verbal formations, Vedic Prose attests the repeated use of the injunctive (14), and of the imperfect (15). Abbi (1992: 151) quotes some other examples of verbal *āmreḍitas* from the *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* (JB), such as the present *jayati* "he wins", here (16). In the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*, there is one interesting case of repeated future verbs (17).

(14) dhārayan-dhārayann *iti śaṃsati prasraṃsād vā antasya bibhāya*

"'*They supported, they supported*', he recites; he fears the slipping down of the end."   (AB 5.15.9)

(15) airayethām-airayethām *ity achāvāka ukthye 'bhyasyati sa hi tatrāntyo bhavati*

"'*Did you divide*', the Achāvāka repeats in the Ukthya sacrifice, for he is then the last."   (AB 6.15.12)

(16) jayati jayati *ya evaṃ veda*

"*He wins, wins / continually wins* who knows thus."

(JB 2.293; Abbi, 1992: 151)

---

[21] In particular, the rule presented here is based on Kātyāyana's *vārttika* 6 in the *Mahābhāṣya* on 8.1.12. On repeated imperatives in Pāṇini, see also Jacobi (1897: 75ff.).

(17) *tad yathā ha vā idam aspaṣṭāvasāne* nehāvasāsyasi nehāvasāsyasi *iti* nonudyanta *evaṃ haivaite 'muṣmāṃl lokān* nonudyante *ta ete pracyavante*

"Just as, indeed, *you will not pause here, you will not pause here* in this world in an unknown resting-place, in the same way *they do not continually destroy* these worlds, *they do not continually destroy* these worlds. Those the same proceed forth."   (GB 2.1.8ef)

In examples (14-15), the sacrificer or the Achāvāka priest is only reciting a certain word two times, and there are no particular semantic or pragmatic implications: for instance, *airayethām* is a quotation from RV 6.69.8 and the priest is repeating this two times during the sacrificial performance.

Conversely, (16) and (17) are more interesting. In (16), *jayati* is not just a word repeated during the sacrifice, nor a quotation from the *Veda*: here, according to my interpretation, it is said that who knows thus (*ya evaṃ veda*), i.e., who knows the sacrificial performance, always wins[22]. The example (17) is particularly notable since the *yathā*-clause contains a repeated future *nehāvasāsyasi nehāvasāsyasi* "you will not pause here, you will not pause here" and its correlative clause (*evaṃ*) attests the intensive *nonudyante* "they push repeatedly": it seems that repeated verbs and intensives are semantically related and can co-occur in the same passage[23].

Pāṇini does not explicitly mention the use of repeated finite verbal forms, except for the imperatives. Nonetheless, the later commentators add cases such as *pacati pacati* "he cooks, he cooks", *jalpati jalpati* "he speaks, he speaks" as examples of *nitya* "reiteration" in Sanskrit (cf. KV *ad* A 8.1.4).

---

[22] According to AMANO (2020: 43) *ya evaṃ vidvān* «may indicate the value of holding a sacrifice and the content of this value is expressed by the main sentence». In several cases from the *Brāhmaṇas*, the main sentence contains an iterative-continuative periphrasis such as *saṃdadhad eti ya evaṃ veda* "he continually puts together who knows thus" (AB 3.18.6). It seems reasonable to assume that, also in this case, the main sentence has an iterative implication.

[23] In the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*, there are only three intensive formations: *nonudyanta* (x2) and *bobudhatha* (cf. PATYAL, 1973).

5.1.2. *Absolutive* āmreḍitas

The innovative feature found in Late Vedic is *āmreḍitas* formed with absolutives. As (18-19) show, the first repetition of absolutive in -*ya* seems to show a rather distributive meaning[24]:

(18) *sa vaí* sammŕ̥jya-sammŕ̥jya pratápya-pratapya *práyachati yáthāvamárśaṃ nirṇijyā́navamarśamuttamám parikṣāláyedevaṃ tattásmāt* pratápya-pratapya *práyachati*
"*Each time he has brushed and heated* (a spoon), he hands it (to the Adhvaryu). Just as, after having rinsed (the eating vessels) while touching them, one would finally rinse them without touching them, so here: for this reason, he hands *over each (spoon) after heating it.*"   (ŚB 1.3.1.8)

(19) [...] *tasmād* vaṣaṭkŕ̥tya-vaṣaṭkŕ̥tya *vāg ity anumantrayeta sa enaṃ śānto na hinasti*
"[...] Therefore, *after each vaṣaṭ call* he should recite as accompaniment 'Speech', appeased it injures him not."   (AB 3.8.2)

Moreover, it is notable that the first *āmreḍitas* formed with the so-called *ṇamul*-absolutives (absolutive in -*am*) show a rather iterative meaning, as in (20-23)[25]:

(20) [...] vyatihā́raṃ-vyatihāraṃ *hy ùttaravedíṃ vyāghāráyanti*
"[...] *turning again and again*, they make the libations on the high-altar."
(ŚB 9.2.1.7b)

(21) saṃghātám̐-saṃghātam̐ *vā́vaíténa yájamāno bhrā́tr̥vyaṃ jayati*
"The sacrificer, *striking* with this *again and again*, defeats the enemy."
(MS 4.1.6)[26]

---

[24] Abbi (1992) found another example of repeated absolutive in -*ya* in JB (2.370).
[25] Etymologically, the absolutive in -*am* is the accusative of a *nomen actionis*. Renou (1935) notes that it is functionally similar to the present participle but can also be used adverbially (e.g., *samā́sam* "together").
[26] Similarly, MS 1.1.6.

(22) *té deváḥ* saṁstambháṁ-saṁstambhaṃ *párājayanta*
"These Gods, *suppressing over and over* (the Asuras) were defeated."

(MS 3.8.1 = MS 3.10.5)[27]

(23) *taíḥ* saṁstambháṁ-saṁstambham *ásurān ajayat* saṁstambháṁ-saṁstambhaṃ *bhrā́tṛvyaṃ jayati yásyaité hūyánte*
"*Suppressing* the Asuras *again and again* by means of these he defeated (them). *Suppressing again and again* he defeats the enemy, when these are offered to him."   (MS 1.4.14; Hock, 1993: 180)

These cases have also been considered iterative in the literature. Hock (1993) takes (22) and (23) as the first unambiguous cases of non-finite verb iteration with aspectual functions. Amano (2009: 175) translates these passages from the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* with iterative constructions, e.g., *saṁstambháṁ-saṁstambhaṃ* "indem er sich immer wieder gegen sie stemmte".

The absolutive in *-am* is an innovation of the Late Vedic period, completely absent in Early Vedic where only certain 'adverbial accusatives' occur (e.g., *nilā́yam, abhyākrā́mam*), which probably constitute an antecedent form of the absolutive construction (cf. Whitney, 1889: 360).

For this reason, it is particularly noteworthy that, since its ancient attestations, an absolutive in *-am* is not only found repeated to express iterativity, but also frequently conjoined with *āmreḍitas*, as in (24-27)[28]:

(24) *párāṅ vā́ eṣá chándobhiḥ svargáṃ lokám ety* anyádanyac *chándaḥ* samāróham
"He goes away with the meters to the world of heaven, *ascending* meters *one after another*."   (MS 1.5.10)[29]

---

[27] A similar passage in GB 2.2.7 which reads *te deváḥ saṃghātaṃsaṃghātaṃ parājayanta*.

[28] Other cases are ŚB 9.3.3.6; TS 5.4.8.2; AB 4.27.4.

[29] For this and similar cases from the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*, AMANO (2009: 378) notes that «das Absolutiv auf *-am*, eigentlich Akkusativ der Zeiterstreckung eines Verbalnomens, bezeichnet eine wiederholte bzw. länger andauernde Handlung; vgl. dazu Oertel (1941: 1478ff.) und Delbrück (1888: 402)».

(25) *té* parāpātam āsata yátra-yatra *ákāmayanta*
     "These (wings) *kept flying everywhere* they wanted."   (MS 1.10.13)

(26) ékaikām utsárjaṃ *mimīte*
     "He measures (it) *setting free one by one*."   (MS 3.7.4)

(27) púnaḥ-punar abhyāvártaṃ *juhoti*
     "He sacrifices *repeating again and again*."   (TB 3.8.6.5.12)

In the same way, the absolutive in *-am* can co-occur with the construction formed with *ha sma* + present, which in Late Vedic denotes an action repeated in the past (Amano, 2019: 17), as in (28); or is found with durative locution (cf. Renou, 1935: 367), as in (29):

(28) *táṁ ha sma vaí vyāghrā́* upaghrā́yaṃ *tūṣṇī́m evā́pakrāmanti*
     "The tigers, *smelling* (him) *again and again*, kept walking away in silence."
                                                                          (MS 2.1.3)

(29) *yat sárvā ánu díśaḥ* parisárpam [...]
     "Whilst *moving round* (the altar) in every direction [...]."
                                                          (ŚB 10.5.5.7b; Renou, 1935: 367)

Unlike *ṇamul*-absolutives, those in *-ya* and *-tvā* do not seem to combine with iterative constructions in Vedic. Consequently, it is reasonable to assume that the *ṇamul*-absolutive originally possessed at least an iterative nuance, considering that it is compatible with iterative adverbs since its earliest attestations (see also Amano, 2009: 186, fn. 272). Hence, the first gerundial *āmreḍitas* with iterative meaning are more likely to be formed with absolutives in *-am*, but not with those in *-ya* and *-tvā*.

In this respect, it is of demonstrative value that some later texts deliberately gloss the absolutive in *-am* with *āmreḍitas* formed with absolutives in *-ya* or *-tvā* (cf. Renou, 1935: 367):

(30) *upasaṃgrāham = upasaṃgṛhyopasaṃgṛhya*
                                                          (BŚS 6.13; Caland, 1903: 43)

Examples like (30) clearly show that the authors recognise the iterative nuance of the absolute in *-am* in Vedic, since they render *upasaṃgrāham* with the corresponding *āmreḍita* formed with a *-ya* absolute (*upasaṃgṛhyopasaṃgṛhya*).

It seems that the use of repeated absolutes to encode iterative meaning has its antecedent in the Late Vedic period and probably starts with the absolute in *-am*, but it continues in the later stages with those in *-tvā* or *-ya*, and has remained well-attested up to modern times: «[these, *scil*. repeated absolutes] are universally used by all South Asian languages to indicate aspects like simultaneity, continuity, iteration, sequentiality and non precipitativity» (Abbi, 1992: 35).

Indeed, after the Vedic period *-tvā* or *-ya āmreḍitas* that express iterativity become more frequent. According to Tikkanen, «the temporal neutralization of the past gerund in modal-instrumental function is, in fact, quite common in later Vedic and Classical and Epic Sanskrit when the gerund is repeated iteratively or with continuous/durative implication» (Tikkanen, 1987: 122).

In Classical and Epic Sanskrit, it is possible to find several cases, presumably formed by extension from *-am*, of absolute *āmreḍitas*. See (31-34):

(31) dṛṣṭvā dṛṣṭvā *samāyāntaṃ tatra tatra janārdanam*
    "*Having seen over and over again* the harasser of men coming there and
    there [...]."   (KūP 1.25.22; Tikkanen, 1987: 201)

(32) utplutyotplutya *maṇḍūkā gacchanti*
    "Frogs move *by jumping and jumping.*"   (Pañc. 2.100; Speijer, 1886: 379)

(33) gatvā gatvā *nalo rājā punar eti sabhāṃ muhuḥ*
    "*Travelling and travelling*, King Nala constantly goes again to the shed."
                              (MBh. 3.59.22)

(34) *bhūtagrāmaḥ sa evāyaṃ bhūtvā bhūtvā pralīyate*
    "This same multiple of beings *being born again and again* disappears."
                           (MBh. 6. BhaGī 8.19.1)

The use of repeated absolutives is not unknown in Pāṇini's time. In the section on absolutives (A 3.4.22) and not on *āmreḍitas*, it is said that both the absolutives in -*tvā* (*anuvṛtti* in A 3.4.18) and in -*am* express, again, *ābhīkṣṇya* "reiteration" when doubled[30]. The KV *ad* A 3.4.22 specifies that absolutives in -*tvā* and -*am* do not express *ābhīkṣṇya* alone; rather, the doubling of the form is required. Also in this case, as in A 3.4.2, for the doubling of the form it is necessary to apply a rule cited in KV *ad* A 8.1.12 (*ābhīkṣṇye dve bhavataḥ* "the repetition occurs when reiteration is denoted")[31]. Pāṇini's rule A 3.4.22 here below:

(35) ābhīkṣṇye *ṇamul ca*

"To express *reiteration* (of an action) (*Ktvā*) and also *ṆamUL* (may be added to a root that expresses the earlier of two actions that have the same agent)."   (A 3.4.22)

6. *From intensives to verbal* āmreḍitas *in Vedic Prose*

In the preceding sections, I have shown that Klein (2003) notes the possible functional overlap between intensives and verbal *āmreḍitas* in Ṛgvedic Sanskrit and, consequently, the absence of the latter. I have also shown that in Vedic Prose the situation is different: intensives are very rare and we find the first verbal *āmreḍitas*, such as *yája-yaja* "sacrifice, sacrifice", *vyatihā́raṃ vyatihāraṃ* "turning again and again", *jayati jayati* "he always wins".

Klein's intuition can be further substantiated by considering the Indian grammatical tradition. Indeed, in Pāṇini's grammar, intensive verbs and verbal *āmreḍitas* seem to encode the same meaning, that is, iterative (*kriyāsamabhihāra*, *nitya* or *ābhīkṣṇya*).

In particular, repeated imperatives express what Pāṇini defines as *kriyāsamabhihāra* "repeated or excessive action". As mentioned

---

[30] Cf. KV *ad* A 3.4.22 *ābhīkṣṇya* = *paunaḥpunya* "over and over again" and it is equivalent to *nitya*.

[31] Again, this rule is based on Kātyāyana's *vārttika* 7 in the *Mahābhāṣya* on 8.1.12.

in § 4, *kriyāsamabhihāra* occurs in two different rules. In Pāṇini's rule *kriyāsamabhihāre loṭ loṭo hisvau vā ca tadhvamoḥ*, here (13), it refers to doubled imperatives (*LOṬ*), which, by A 8.1.4, also represent constant repetition (*nitya*). In the second rule, A 3.1.22, it refers to the meaning of intensive verbs (*yaṄ*, i.e., formed with suffix *-ya-*) as, for example, int. *pāpacyate* "cooks repeatedly", int. *yāyajyate* "repeatedly performs ritual sacrifice" (Sharma, 2002: 255)[32]. In other words, both repeated imperatives and intensives are semantically iterative: as the KV *ad* A 3.4.2 specifies, in the former case, that is the imperatives, the iterativity is expressed only through the repetition of the word, while in the latter the same notion is inherent to the verb and no repetition is needed (*na apekṣate dvirvacanam*, cf. KV *ad* A 3.4.2)[33].

But this same equivalence in meaning is also found with regard to repeated absolutes and intensives. The repetition of absolutes is explained by Pāṇini as an expression of *ābhīkṣṇya* "reiteration". As already noted, the *Kāśikāvṛtti* glosses *ābhīkṣṇya* as *nitya* and in its explanation of A 8.1.4 (*nityavīpsayoḥ*) points out the close relation between repeated absolutes and intensive forms: "which words express constant repetition (*nitya*)? [...] the gerund in *-tvā*, the gerund in *-am* and the imperative (*LOṬ*) have denotative power to make manifest the repetition (of an action) (*paunaḥpunya*) only when they require doubling"[34]. At the same time, "*yaṄ* (the intensive) expresses the same meaning while lacking that requirement" (KV *ibid*.).

---

[32] Cf. *dhātor ekāco halādeḥ kriyāsamabhihāre yaṅ* "affix *yaṄ* optionally occurs after a monosyllabic verbal root beginning with a consonant when *kriyāsamabhihāra* is denoted" (A 3.1.22; tr. Sharma, 2002: 255).

[33] Cf. *kriyāsamabhihārābhivyaktau   dvirvacanam   ayaṃ   loḍ   apekṣate, kriyāsamabhihāre dve bhavataḥ iti / yaṅpratyayaḥ punar asminn eva arthe vidhīyamānaḥ svayam eva śaktatvān na apekṣate dvirvacanam* "In expressing the frequency of an act, this imperative expects the repetition of a word: 'In the meaning of the frequency of an act, [the word] is doubled' (cf. *Mahābhāṣya vārttika* 6). However, the suffix *yaṄ* being introduced (*vidhīyamānaḥ*) in this meaning, because [*yaṄ*] is able [to express the meaning] by itself, it does not expect the repetition of a word" (KV *ad* A 3.4.2).

[34] Cf. *keṣu   nityatā   [...]   ktvāṇamulorloṭaś   ca   dvirvacanāpekṣāyām   eva paunaḥpunyaprakāśane śaktiḥ* "What words express constancy? *Ktvā*, *ṆamUL*, and *LOṬ* have denotative power to make manifest the repetition (of an action) (*paunaḥpunya*) only when they require doubling" (KV *ad* A 8.1.4). In this case, the iterative meaning is not inherent to the verb itself, but it needs a sort of external 'illumination' (*prakāśa*) to become evident.

Crucially, in KV *ad* A 8.1.4, the value of the intensive category (*yaṄ*) is clarified through the example *punaḥ punaḥ pacati = pāpacyate* "he cooks again and again", that is, through a combination of a simple verb (*pacati*) plus an *āmreḍita* compound (*punaḥ punaḥ*)[35]. This type of combination, functionally equivalent to intensive verbs, is commonly found in Vedic Prose:

(36) *indrāgnī* ajohavuḥ (= RV 7.94.10b) *iti indrāgnī eva etayā* ahar-ahar nihvayante
   "*They repeatedly invoked* Indra and Agni (= RV 7.94.10b), verily with this (verse) *day by day they invoke* Indra and Agni."   (AB 6.6.5)

In fact, in (36) a Ṛgvedic verse containing the intensive verb *ajohavuḥ* "they repeatedly invoked" is quoted at AB 6.6.5 and glossed as *ahar-ahar nihvayante* "day by day they invoke" (cf. Jamison, 1983a; Ronzitti, 2009: 145), corresponding to what we have observed above.

7. Conclusions

In this paper, 318 *āmreḍita* compounds in Vedic prose were identified. As argued, Vedic Prose exhibits some innovations not attested in the earliest stage of the language, such as the 'proximity' and the 'attenuated' meaning encoded by some forms, along with the first vocative and verbal *āmreḍitas* (with the sole exception of *píbā-piba* (*ít*)). Notably, these innovations found in the Vedic prose corpus are taught by Pāṇini, consistent with the fact that the language described in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* can probably be identified with the Late Vedic language.

Furthermore, my Vedic prose corpus attests the use of verbal *āmreḍitas* that are mostly formed with absolutives. The data concerning absolutive *āmreḍitas* show that, in Vedic, those whose members are the

---

[35] Cf. *yaṅ tu tannirapekṣaḥ prakāśayati, punaḥ punaḥ pacati pāpacyate iti* "*yaṄ* (intensive) makes this manifest while lacking that requirement (i.e., *dvirvacana*), as in *pāpacyate* (which means) 'he cooks again and again'" (KV *ad* A 8.1.4).

so-called *ṇamul*-absolutes express iterativity, while in Classical and Epic Sanskrit the repetition of *-tvā* or *-ya* gerund occurs with the same meaning. It has been also shown that the iterative meaning of absolutive *āmreḍitas* was triggered by the *ṇamul*-absolutes and only later comes to involve the other formations.

Finally, this paper has suggested an innovative explanation for the increase of verbal *āmreḍitas* in Vedic Prose. As the Sanskrit grammarians already noted, there exists a relationship between verbal *āmreḍitas* – including absolutes and finite verbs – and the intensive category, both in fact encoding *nitya* (= *abhīkṣṇya*) "reiteration" (cf. KV *ad* A 8.1.4). The Early Vedic language expresses 'reiteration' mostly with the intensive category, whereas verbal *āmreḍitas* represent only an isolated case. As I have shown, these compounds became more widespread during the Late Vedic period when the intensive category was totally recessive. For this reason, it seems plausible that while the reduplicated intensive category was gradually disappearing, in the Late Vedic language two new constructions are found which show repetition and are functionally equivalent to the intensive: the first construction is the verbal *āmreḍita* and the second is the combination of *āmreḍita* plus a simple verb.

Abbreviations of texts (text sigla)

A:	*Aṣṭādhyāyī*	KūP:	*Kūrmapurāṇa*
AB:	*Aitareyabrāhmaṇa*	KV:	*Kāśikāvṛtti*
BhaGī:	*Bhagavadgītā*	MBh.:	*Mahābhārata*
BR:	*Brāhmaṇas*	MS:	*Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*
BŚS:	*Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra*	Pañc.:	*Pañcatantra*
Ch.Up.:	*Chandogya Upaniṣad*	RV:	*Ṛgveda*
GB:	*Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*	ŚB:	*Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*
JB:	*Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*	TB:	*Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa*

References

ABBI, A. (1992), *Reduplication in South Asian Languages: An Areal, Typological and Historical Study*, Allied Publishers, New Delhi.

AMANO, K. (2009), Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā *I–II. Übersetzung der Prosapartien mit Kommentar zur Lexik und Syntax der älteren vedischen Prosa* (Münchner Forschungen zur historischen Sprachwissenschaft, 9), Hempen, Bremen.

AMANO, K. (2019), *The development of the uses of* ha / ha vái / ha sma vái *with or without the narrative perfect and language layers in the old* Yajurveda-Saṃhitā *texts*, in «Lingua Posnaniensis», 61, 2, pp. 11-24.

AMANO, K. (2020), *What is "knowledge" justifying a Ritual Action? Uses of* yá evám véda / yá evám vidván *in the* Maitrayaṇi Saṃhitā, in REDARD, C., FERRER-LOSILLA, J., MOEIN, H. and SWENNEN, P. (2020, *éds.*), *Aux sources des liturgies indo-iraniennes*, Presses Universitaires de Liège, Liège, pp. 39-68.

BRONKHORST, J. (1982), *The Variationist Pāṇini and Vedic: A review article*, in «Indo-Iranian Journal», 24, pp. 273-282.

CALAND, W. (1903), *Über das rituelle* Sūtra *des* Baudhāyana, Brockhaus, Leipzig.

CARDONA, G. (1993), *The* Bhāṣika *Accentuation System*, in «Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik», 18, pp. 1-40.

CARDONA, G. (1996), Āmreḍita *compounds?*, in SCHMIDT, H. and WEZLER, A. (1996, *Hrsg.*), Vedavyākaraṇa-vyākhyāna: *Festschrift Paul Thieme zum 90. Geburtstag am 18. März 1995*, special issue of «Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik», 20, pp. 67-72.

COLLITZ, H. (1882), *Ueber eine besondere Art vedischer Composita*, in *Verhandlungen des fünften internationalen Orientalisten-Congresses: gehalten zu Berlin im September 1881*. Vol. 2, 2, A. Asher and Co. Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, Berlin, pp. 287-298.

DEGENER, A. (1987), *Khotanische Komposita*, in «Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft», 48, pp. 27-69.

DELBRÜCK, B. (1888), *Altindische Syntax*, Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, Halle.

DITRICH, T. (2011), *The typology of* āmreḍita *compounds in the* Ṛgveda, in «Acta linguistica asiatica», 1, pp. 71-83.

DRESSLER, W. (1968), *Ved.* divé-dive *und die idg. Iterativkomposita*, in MAYRHOFER, M. (1968, *Hrsg.*), *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturkunde: Gedenkschrift für Wilhelm Brandenstein*, AMOE, Innsbruck, pp. 39-47.

DUNKEL, G.E. (1981a), Āmreḍita *and iteration of preverbs in Vedic and Hittite*, in «Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung», 95, 2, pp. 214-226.

DUNKEL, G.E. (1981b), *Further traces of preverbal* āmreḍita *in Greek and Latin*, in «Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung», 95, 2, pp. 226-231.

EGGELING, J. (1882-1900), *The* Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa *according to the Text of the* Mādhyandina *School*. 5 vols., Clarendon Press, Oxford.

GARCÍA RAMÓN, J.L. (2014), *On polymorphic presents in the* Rig Veda: *reduplication and 'Aktionsart'*, in KLEIN, J.S. and TUCKER, E. (2014, eds.), *Vedic and Sanskrit Historical linguistics: Papers from the 13th World Sanskrit Conference*, Motilal Banarsidass, New Delhi, pp. 45-78.

GERSHEVITCH, I. (1961), *Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

GIANNAKIS, G.K. (1997), *Studies in the Syntax and Semantics of the Reduplicated Presents of Homeric Greek and Indo-European* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 90), Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, Innsbruck.

Gippert, J., Martín, J., Korn, A. and Mittmann, R. (2016), *Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text-und Sprachmaterialien* (TITUS) [available online at *https://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/indexe.htm*, accessed on 28.02.2023].

Gonda, J. (1975), *Vedic literature* (= *History of Indian Literature*, 1, 1), Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

Hellwig, O. (2010-2021), DCS – *The Digital Corpus of Sanskrit* [available online at *http://www.sanskrit-linguistics.org/dcs/index.php*, accessed on 03.03.2023].

Hellwig, O., Scarlata, S. and Widmer, P. (2021), *Reassessing Rigvedic Strata*, in «Journal of the American Oriental Society», 141, 4, pp. 847-865.

Hock, H.H. (1993), Review to 'Abbi, A., *Reduplication in South Asian Languages: An Areal, Typological, and Historical Study*, Allied Publishers, New Delhi, 1992', in «Studies in the Linguistic Sciences», 23, 1, pp. 169-192.

Hume, R.E. (1921), *The Thirteen Principal* Upanishads*. Translated from the Sanskrit with an Outline of the Philosophy of the* Upanishads *and an Annotated Bibliography*, Humphrey Milford / Oxford University Press, London.

Jacobi, H. (1897), *Kompositum und Nebensatz, Studien über die indogermanische Sprachentwicklun*, Cohen, Bonn.

Jamison, S.W. (1983a), *Two Problems in the Inflection of the Vedic Intensive*, in «Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft», 42, pp. 41-73.

Jamison, S.W. (1983b), *Function and form in the -áya-formations of the* Rig Veda *and* Atharva Veda, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Jamison, S.W. and Brereton, J.P. (2014), *The* Rigveda*: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India. An English translation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford / New York.

Jensen, H. (1959), *Altarmenische Grammatik*, C. Winter, Heidelberg.

Joshi, S.D. and Roodbergen, J.A.F. (1974), Vedavyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Bahuvrīhidvandvāhnika *(P. 2.2.23-2.2.38)* (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, 9), University of Poona, Poona.

KEITH, A.B. (1920), Rigveda Brāhmaṇas*: The* Aitareya *and* Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇas *of the* Rigveda (Harvard Oriental Series, 25), Harvard University Press, Cambridge (MA).

KLEIN, J.S. (2003), Āmreḍitas *and Related Constellations in the* Rigveda, in «Journal of the American Oriental Society», 123, pp. 773-802.

KULIKOV, L. (2005), *Reduplication in the Vedic verb: Indo-European inheritance, analogy, and iconicity*, in HURCH, B. (2005, *ed.*), *Studies on Reduplication*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

LAZZERONI, R. (2011), *Classi di presente e raddoppiamento in alcune lingue indoeuropee*, in «Archivio Glottologico Italiano», 96, 2, pp. 129-145.

LAZZERONI, R. and MAGNI, E. (2020), *Reduplicated presents and pluractionality in Greek and Sanskrit*, in «Studi e Saggi Linguistici», 58, 2, pp. 9-32.

LOWE, J.J. (2017), *Transitive nouns and adjectives: Evidence from Early Indo-Aryan*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

LUBOTSKY, A. (1997), *A Ṛgvedic Word Concordance*. 2 vols., American Oriental Society, New Haven.

MEISSNER, T. and TRIBULATO, O. (2002), *Nominal composition in Mycenaean Greek*, in «Transactions of the Philological Society», 100, 3, pp. 289-330.

OERTEL, H. (1941), *Die Dativi finales abstrakter Nomina und andere Beispiele nominaler Satzfügung in der vedischen Prosa*, Beck, München.

OZONO, J. (2018), *Untersuchung der bei Pāṇini angeführten vedischen Formen: Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung reduplizierter Verbalstämme*, Sendai, Tohoku.

PATYAL, H.C. (1969), Gopatha Brāhmaṇa. *English Translation with Notes and Introduction*, Diss. University of Poona.

PATYAL, H.C. (1973), *Remarkable Verbal Forms of the* Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, in «Bulletin of the Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute», 33, pp. 253-258.

POTT, A.F. (1862), *Doppelung (Reduplikation, Gemination) als eines der wichtigsten Bildungsmittelder Sprache, beleuchtet aus Sprachen aller Welttheile, durch Aug. Friedr. Pott.*, Lemgo / Detmold, Meyer.

Renou, L. (1935), *L'absolutif sanskrit en -am*, in «Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris», 23, pp. 359-392.

Ronzitti, R. (2009), *Poesia, metalinguaggio e scienza: l'intensivo della radice aind. vart- e RV X,129,1*, in «Atti del Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese», 4, pp. 141-152.

Salemann, C. (1930), *A Middle-Persian grammar*, British India Press, Bombay.

Schaefer, C. (1994), *Das Intensivum im Vedischen*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Sharma, R.N. (2002), *The* Aṣṭādhyāyī *of Pāṇini. Vol. 3: English Translation of* Adhyāyas *Two and Three with Sanskrit Text, Transliteration, Word-Boundary,* Anuvṛtti*,* Vṛtti*, Explanatory notes, Derivational History of Examples, and Indices*, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, New Delhi.

Sharma, R.N. (2003), *The* Aṣṭādhyāyī *of Pāṇini. Vol. 6: English Translation of* Adhyāyas *Seven and Eight with Sanskrit Text, Transliteration, Word-Boundary,* Anuvṛtti*,* Vṛtti*, Explanatory notes, Derivational History of Examples, and Indices*, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, New Delhi.

Shastri, S.D. and Shukla, K. (1965-1967, eds.), Nyāsa *or* Pañcikā *Commentary of Ācārya Jinendrabuddhipāda and* Padamañjarī *of Haradatta Miśra on the* Kāśikāvṛtti [*Commentary on the* Aṣṭādhyāyī *of Pāṇini*] *of Vāmana-Jayāditya* (6 vols.), Prachya Bharati Prakashan, Varanasi.

Speijer, J.S. (1886), *Sanskrit Syntax*, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited, Delhi.

Stolz, T., Stroh, C. and Urdze, A. (2011), *Total Reduplication. The Areal Linguistics of a Potential Universal*, Akademie, Bremen.

Tikkanen, B. (1987), *The Sanskrit Gerund: A Synchronic, Diachronic, and Typological Analysis*, Finnish Oriental Society, Helsinki.

Tribulato, O. (2015), *Ancient Greek Verb-Initial Compounds: Their Diachronic Development Within the Greek Compound System*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Wackernagel, J. (1957), *Altindische Grammatik: Einleitung zur Wortlehre, Nominalkomposition. Band 2, 1* (2nd ed.), Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Whitney, W.D. (1885), *The Roots, Verb-Forms and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language*, Breitkopf and Härtel, Leipzig.

Whitney, W.D. (1889), *A Sanskrit Grammar*, Breitkopf and Härtel, Leipzig.

Whitney, W.D. (1893), *On recent studies on Hindu grammar*, in «American Journal of Philology», 12, pp. 171-197.

Yates, A.D. (2014), *The Anatolian* āmreḍitas*: Distribution, Function and Prehistory*, paper presented at the 224th Annual Meeting of the American Oriental Society (Phoenix, March 15, 2014).

Beatrice Grieco
Dipartimento di Lettere e Culture moderne
Università degli Studi di Roma 'La Sapienza'
Piazzale Aldo Moro 5
00185 Roma (Italy)
beatrice.grieco@uniroma1.it