

# NOTES ON THE INDO-EUROPEAN $k^u$ i- AND $k^u$ o-PRONOUNS

## Summary

Some attempts to answer the question as to the historical relations of the indefinite and interrogative functions of the Indo-European  $k^u$ -pronouns are reviewed and criticized. The well-known practice of considering the indefinites of the types Goth. *hwazuh*, AInd. *kaścid* derivatives of the interrogative is open to dispute. The identity, in Indo-European, of the interrogatives and the indefinites has, even in particulars concerning their functions, many non-I.E. parallels. Some suggestions are given in connection with the explication of Gr. *ὅστις*, AInd. *yah kaśca*, *kaścid*, etc. Supplementary observations are made on the theories of the relative use of these pronominal stems.

## I

It is a curious coincidence that while the problem of the chronologic relation between the indefinite and interrogative functions of the Indo-European pronominal stems  $k^u$ e/o- and  $k^u$ i- have given rise to much controversial discussion, many authors of grammars should cling to the time-honoured practice of teaching<sup>1)</sup> that it is the interrogative which combining with certain particles assumes an indefinite force<sup>2)</sup>. Yet the question may arise whether this practice can be

---

<sup>1)</sup> The ancients regarded the rel. pron. as a postpositive article, the indef. as a noun. However, the Stoics and, under their influence, some grammarians put it on a par with the article. For particulars: H. Steinthal, *Gesch. d. Sprachw. bei den Griechen und Römern*, Berlin 1863, p. 668 f.; M. H. Jelinek, *Gesch. d. neuhochdeutschen Gramm.* II, Heidelberg 1914, p. 269 ff.; 279 f.

<sup>2)</sup> K. Brugmann, *Grundriss*<sup>2</sup>, II, 2 (1911) expressed himself in a rather cautious way: p. 348: "Als solche (interr. und indef.) fungierten, nur durch die Betonung von einander unterschieden ...", p. 350: "Die vorgenannten Pronomina, die als Interrogativa..., dienten zugleich als Indefinita". Cf., however, A. Leskien, *Gramm. d. altbulg. Spr.* (1919) p. 138: "*kŭto*, *čŭto* werden durch Vorsetzung von *ně-* indefinitiv" (cf. *Lit. Lesebuch* (1919), p. 161); E. Sieg-W. Siegling, *Tocharische Grammatik* (1931), p. 183; A. J. van Windekens, *Morphologie comparée du tokharien*, Louvain 1944, p. 196; A. Vaillant, *Manuel du vieux slave* (1948), p. 138: "L'interrogatif est ...; avec des éléments préposés ..., on a l'indéfini ..."; W. Krause, *Hdb. d.*

justified. Before attempting to find an answer it will however be necessary first to reconsider the other point, viz. the relations between the interrogative and the indefinite functions when fulfilled by the same, or by related, pronominal forms.

It is no matter for great surprise that the co-existence of an interrogative  $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  and an indefinite  $\tau\iota\varsigma$  in Greek, of a similar *quis?*: *quis* in Latin, of *wat?* "what?" beside *wat* "something" in Dutch, has led those students of comparative I.E. linguistics who were mainly, or exclusively, interested in the investigation of historical developments to transpose the underlying problem into a question of priority: which function must be regarded as more original, which as younger, derived, or secondary? "La double valeur, déjà indo-européenne ... du radical représenté par lat. *quis*, *quid*, *quod* etc. ne saurait être ancienne. Il faut que l'une des valeurs soit issue de l'autre" <sup>3</sup>). Considering the main points of relevance with regard to the use of these I.E. pronouns the conclusion may, however, — despite the more or less assertive attempts to vindicate the priority of either function — appear to be warranted that the question as to their original character is not well posed if it is only formulated in terms of an alternative: were they primarily interrogatives or indefinites in the modern sense of these words?

The reconstruction of the prehistoric development has been a matter of considerable, and essentially glottogonic, speculation among scholars. Whatever choice is made of the above possibilities, the answer always implies that there have been, in the history of the I.E. peoples, times in which either the interrogative or the indefinite idea was not expressed, at least not by means of the stems under consideration. As long as the consequences of this implication are not recognized and accounted for no solution proposed for the above problem can be considered acceptable.

Leaving this point here and going into some particulars I am under the impression that the advocates of neither standpoint have

---

Gotischen (1953), p. 190 (cf. p. 189): "Dem Interrogativpronomen ... wird das enkl. Element *-uh* angehängt" (> *hvazuh* "jeder"); L. Renou, *Gramm. de la langue védique* (1952), p. 382: "L'interrogatif est suivi d'un grand nombre de particules, qui lui confèrent ... une valeur ... "généralisante" ou "éventualisante"', etc. etc.

<sup>3</sup>) A. Meillet, in the BSL. 23 (1922), p. 19 f.

succeeded in adducing conclusive arguments. Among those scholars who hold the indefinite function to be older Hirt <sup>4)</sup> attached much value to the zero grade of the stem  $k^u i-$ : "die Form  $*k^u i-$ s zeigt eine Schwundstufe, muß also in unbetonter Stellung entstanden sein; aus einem Satz *es hat einer (wer) geklopft* kann sich sehr leicht eine Frage entwickeln: *hat wer geklopft?*" But if  $*k^u i-$  has arisen in an enclitic position, from what has it arisen? From a form  $*k^u ei-$ , which is in the 'Vollstufe' <sup>5)</sup>, and which, in Hirt's line of thought, was not likely to be an indefinite <sup>6)</sup>? And what about the stem  $k^u e-/k^u o-$  which, being in the 'Vollstufe', can likewise convey an indefinite sense? Meillet <sup>7)</sup>, who regards the indefinite function as original because "on conçoit que, en mettant l'intonation interrogative sur l'indéfini, dans une phrase telle que *quelqu'un est venu*, le mot signifiant *quelqu'un* prenne la valeur interrogative, surtout s'il est court", does not seem to have faced the ensuing problem how far an initial  $*k^u i-$  has ever been, as the Fr. *quelqu'un* can be, non-interrogative in meaning. Equivalents of the unaccented  $*k^u i-$  in modern languages can at the beginning of a sentence be indefinite, but how are we to know if the I.E. indefinite  $k^u i-$  was usual in that position?: Greek instances of an initial  $\tau\iota\varsigma$  do not crop up before Sophocles and Plato <sup>8)</sup>, and the Latin indef. *quis* is always an enclitic <sup>9)</sup>. I am afraid that I cannot follow the same French savant and his compatriot Vendryes in their argument <sup>10)</sup> that Gr.  $\tau\iota\varsigma$  does not lose its accent even under those circumstances which would condition barytonesis of other words. Are they of the opinion that the interrogative intonation and, hence,

---

<sup>4)</sup> H. Hirt, *Indogermanische Grammatik* III, p. 26 (§ 21); cf. VII, p. 40 (§ 40).

<sup>5)</sup> In English books the term 'normal grade' is often used. But are the other grades abnormal?

<sup>6)</sup> The form  $*k^u ei-$  is given by J. Pokorny, *Indog. etymol. Wörterbuch* (1953), p. 646, although only  $*k^u i-$  exists.

<sup>7)</sup> Meillet, l.c.

<sup>8)</sup> See E. Schwyzler-A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik*, II, p. 214. — Cf. also *infra*, p. 268.

<sup>9)</sup> Similar suggestions, for instance that made by Ph. Wegener, *Untersuchungen über die Grundfragen des Sprachlebens*, Halle 1885, p. 76, are, for reasons of space, left undiscussed.

<sup>10)</sup> A. Meillet-J. Vendryes, *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*<sup>2</sup>, Paris 1948, p. 608 f.

the interrogative force, did not yet exist when, in prehistoric times, the relevant Greek rules of accentuation became fixed? Whatever the real factors were which played a rôle in the processes of barytonesis, it is evident that the opposition expressed by *τίς* : *τις* predisposed these words, like *σέ* : *σε* etc.<sup>11)</sup>, to special treatment.

Those scholars who developed the other thesis would draw attention to phenomena of secondary absence of accent. The Slav. *kŭ*-pronoun "erhält die bedeutung eines pron. indef. dadurch, dass es tonlos wird, in welchem falle es meist einem oder mehreren worten des satzes nachgesetzt wird" (Miklosich<sup>12)</sup>); "ursprünglich ist ... wohl der interrogative Gebrauch ... aus ihm ist durch Tonminderung in eingeschalteter bzw. Enklisenstellung die indefinite Verwendung entstanden" (Hofmann<sup>13</sup>). There is however room for the observation that it is, in historical times, as a rule for the sake of emphasis that the interrogative pronoun — which usually opens the sentence — is occasionally placed in another position: cf. e.g. Soph. El. 1191 *τοῖς* (viz. *τοῖς φονεῦσι*) *τοῦ* "(with the murderers) of whom?"; O.C. 412 *ἄ δ' ἐννέπεις, κλύουσα τοῦ λέγεις*; "what you tell, from whom did you hear it?"; Arist. Nub. 239 *ἤλθες δὲ κατὰ τί*;

According to Leumann<sup>14)</sup> the unaccented indefinite has, in part, arisen from the accented interrogative in so-called 'mehrzielige' interrogations, e.g. α 170 *τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν* "who are you among men, and from whence"<sup>15</sup>? Now this type of sentence, though occurring in many ancient I.E. languages (Greek, Anc.Indian, Latin, Slavonic, German), is nowhere very frequent and does not seem to have been in general usage (with the probable exception of some short phrases): the Latin instances belong, as far as I am able to see, mainly to Cicero, Livy and some later authors<sup>16)</sup>; most of the Anc.Indian cases quoted

<sup>11)</sup> I refer to Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 387; see also B. Laum, *Das alexandrinische Akzentuationssystem*<sup>5</sup>, Paderborn 1928, p. 170 f.; 251 f.

<sup>12)</sup> F. Miklosich, *Vergl. Gramm. d. slavischen Spr.* IV, p. 86.

<sup>13)</sup> J. B. Hofmann, in Stolz-Schmalz, *Lateinische Gramm.*<sup>5</sup>, p. 645.

<sup>14)</sup> M. Leumann, in Stolz-Schmalz, o.c., p. 288.

<sup>15)</sup> See H. Schuchardt, in the *Analecta Graeciensia*, Graz 1893, p. 197 ff.; Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, I, p. 511; III, p. 259 f.; O. Behaghel, *Deutsche Syntax*, III, p. 431. — According to Schuchardt this construction is rather frequent in Hungarian, Rumanian, and the Slavonic languages, but see W. Vondrák, *Vergl. Slavische Grammatik*<sup>2</sup>, Göttingen 1928, II, p. 451.

<sup>16)</sup> I refer to Hofmann, o.c., p. 647.

by Wackernagel<sup>17)</sup> and other scholars smell of elaboration or more or less didactic argumentation. Delbrück's<sup>18)</sup> opinion, approved by Schwyzer-Debrunner<sup>19)</sup>, seems reasonable: we would not appear to be justified in taking for granted that this construction was a feature in the syntax of Orig. Indo-European<sup>20)</sup>.

In discussing this problem and in pronouncing for the secondary character of the indefinite force of these words H. Frei<sup>21)</sup> lays great stress upon an argument which seems to be hard to follow. Transforming the problem, which is essentially historical in nature, into a question of synchronic linguistics, the Swiss author states that in various languages the interrogative pronoun is a simple word: Lat. *quis*; Fr. *qui*; Germ. *wer*; the indefinite, on the other hand, a combination of this word and one or more other elements: *aliquis*, *quisque*; *n'importe qui*; *wer es auch sei* etc. Regarding the additional elements as 'signes de transposition', he draws the conclusion that it is these 'signs' which always commute interrogatives into indefinites. Letting the terminology alone, which though applied to static facts suggests historical processes — an inconsistency often found in the works of phonologists and structuralists —, these observations are, as far as definite forms, definite periods, and definite languages are concerned, right: leaving the relative function out of consideration, the Eng. *who* is, in itself, interrogative, *whoever* is indefinite, *ever* being, in this word-group and similar cases, a sign of indefiniteness. But does it follow that this sign 'transposes', or transforms, an interrogative into an indefinite? It may be true that the ordinary speakers of a language — Frei refers to "la conscience des sujets" —, if they are invited to reflect upon this point, are inclined to identify *who* in *whoever* with the interrogative pronoun; but must we follow them? In Dutch the form *loop* is the imper. sing., *ik loop* means "I am walking": can we reasonably contend that *ik* transforms an impera-

<sup>17)</sup> A. Debrunner-J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, III, p. 565.

<sup>18)</sup> Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, III, p. 260: "Es versteht sich übrigens, dass es sich um eine Ausdrucksweise handelt, die überall einmal aus einem besonderen Grunde gewagt werden kann".

<sup>19)</sup> Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 630.

<sup>20)</sup> For the theory defended by Meunier in 1875 see H. Frei, *Interrogatif et Indéfini*, Paris 1940, p. 8.

<sup>21)</sup> See n. 20.

tive into a finite verb form of the 1<sup>st</sup> pers. sing.? I for one would prefer to say that it is the stem — or whatever name one wishes to give to that element common to a group of words which is obtained by abstracting inflexional elements and all other linguistic entities or features which constitute it a word and which help to determine the class and function of that word —, which combining with an element zero <sup>22)</sup> expresses an order or desire and which combining with “I” helps to form an 1<sup>st</sup> pers. sing. It is not the ‘addition’ of the ending *-en* which transforms a Dutch sing. *boek* “book” into a plural: *boeken*, because the regular singular is *een boek* “a book” or *het boek* “the book”, the form *boek* by itself being indifferent as to number: *boekband* “binding of a book”; *boekliefhebber* “one who is fond of books”. So it might be more correct to say that *who* in *whoever* is not a particular pronoun, but an abstract pronominal stem which without *ever* or other accretions or accompaniments and under certain conditions of intonation etc. can have a real existence and help to form definite interrogative sentences. Be this as it may — questions of structural formulation cannot detain us here —, it is, in my opinion, an inadmissible conclusion that the interrogative function of \**kʷi-* etc. is, on the strength of the examples discussed by Frei, more original than the indefinite. If we may, for the sake of simplicity, say that in the Dutch *ik loop*, *ik* indicates that *loop* is no imperative, does it follow that any form *loop* originally was an imperative? Frei answers a similar question in connection with the pronouns at issue in the affirmative, because he holds the pair *who?*: *whoever* to be a feature of many languages — at least in those “*états de langue où l’on peut sonder la conscience des sujets*”. In so doing he however focusses attention only on those languages which do not, or hardly, possess a simple indefinite corresponding to the forms instanced, or, rather, he disregards the coexistence of simple indefinites and words of the type *whoever*. How are we to account for the Latin indefinite *quis*, if we consider *aliquis* and *quisque* to be ‘transposed’ interrogatives <sup>23)</sup>

---

<sup>22)</sup> This point has sometimes been a matter of confusion: L. H. Gray, *Foundations of language*, New York 1939, p. 150 holds that it is the base (“stem”) which (in Latin) can be used alone in two instances: as the 2<sup>nd</sup> sg. act. imp. of the verb, or as the voc. sg. of the noun. We had better say that these forms contain the stem and the inflectional ending zero.

<sup>23)</sup> It may be conceded that “*en interrogeant la conscience des sujets*”

Here the Swiss author would no doubt refer to his remarks with regard to the transposing function of pitch or accent and consider *quis* (indef.) to be characterized by the absence of the 'interrogative intonation'. This answer would, in a way, be correct, but it does not prove the historical priority of the accented *\*k<sup>u</sup>is*. Even if we could state that all languages possess an accented interrogative pronoun beside an unaccented, but otherwise identical, unaccented indefinite, we could not by the mere observation that in the latter the accent is absent, conclude that it was lost. The absence of a feature can also mean that it has never existed <sup>24)</sup>.

## II

So no solution propounded for the problem of the 'original character' of the interr.-indef. stems *\*k<sup>u</sup>e-/k<sup>u</sup>o-* and *\*k<sup>u</sup>i-* <sup>25)</sup> has, as far as I am

we must regard the Dutch *wie* as an interrogative and *wie ook* as an indefinite, but with regard to the neuter *wat* — free from its context, of course, say in its written form —, which is often indefinite, this view cannot be maintained.

<sup>24)</sup> It may be added in passing that the present author is not able to follow Frei's exposition on p. 14 where he tries to show that the interrogative pronoun belongs to language, the indefinite to speech.

<sup>25)</sup> For attempts made to distinguish between these stems see J. Wackernagel, Kuhn's Zs. 29, p. 144; W. Caland, Zur Syntax der Pronomina im Avesta, Amsterdam 1891, p. 50 n.; Delbrück, Vergl. Syntax I, p. 510 f., and especially E. Benveniste, in the *Studia Baltica* III, Rome 1933, p. 124; 128 f., whose observations, however important and ingenuous (cf. Caland, l.c.), do not solve all problems. The relation between interr. and indef. pronouns is not identical with that between deictic and anaphoric pronouns (the former being characterized by the thematic vowel, the latter by the *i*). Indefinite pronouns are not always enclitic (cf. AInd. *mā kâḥ*; Lat. *aliquis* etc.) or indifferent as to case, number, etc. One cannot go so far as to contend that the linguistic evidence provided by the ancient I.E. idioms proves that they always had a "valeur faible", never had a dative, genitive etc.; instances of *ὅς τις* as are e.g. found Δ 240 *ὅς τις αἶ ... ἴδοι ... | τοὺς ...* "whomsoever again ... them ..."; O 743 etc. can hardly be said to be in consonance with the hypothesis that *\*k<sup>u</sup>i-* originally was, in function, comparable to *iv* etc.; are we to believe that once no genitives, datives, etc. of an indef. pronoun existed, despite the many verbs etc. which governed these cases? (cf. e.g. B 388; π 305). The Homeric etc. (see Schwyzler-Debrunner, o.c., I, p. 616) gen. *τῷ*, Lat. *cuius*, *cui* (e.g. Plaut. Amph. 67), Ved. *kasya* etc., all of them admitting of an indefinite use, induce us to conclude that these case-forms,

able to see, met with general acceptance. However, neither the cautious and methodically correct opinion pronounced by Delbrück <sup>26)</sup> — “diese Frage ist durch die Mittel einer historischen Untersuchung nicht zu lösen ... (es genügt) festzustellen, dass in der Urzeit bereits beide Gebrauchsweisen vorhanden waren” — nor the intelligent observations of Wackernagel <sup>27)</sup> — in both cases (viz. the interr. and the indef. use “handelt es sich um Unbekanntes ...; Hochtönigkeit charakterisiert die Frage überhaupt, und andererseits passt untergeordnete Stelle im Satze für die Bezeichnung eines Begriffs, den man nicht scharf bezeichnen will oder kann” — can absolve us from the obligation to look more closely at the difficulties which remain unsolved. What was the character of the clauses and sentences containing these elements? How are we to account for the various particulars in the use of the words deriving from these stems?; how could they, for instance, also assume a relative function? Was pre-

deriving from *\*k<sup>u</sup>e/o-*, were already employed in that way. The very fact that the various *\*k<sup>u</sup>-* stems are, in the ancient languages, differently distributed in the nominative and accusative, and in the adverbial forms (τὸς τὸς τὶ; ποῖος πότερος πόθεν ποῦ etc., interr. and indef.; *kañ kã kim* (*cid*), *kadã* etc., but *kuitra* etc.) seems to point to a considerable degree of interchangeability in ‘Orig. I.-E.’ A more satisfactory hypothesis would perhaps be the following: the ‘strong forms’, i.e. *\*k<sup>u</sup>e-/k<sup>u</sup>o-*, were especially used when sex (gender) must be indicated — cf. e.g. the adj. use in Latin: *quae patria est tua?* —; the stem *\*k<sup>u</sup>i-*, which could not express sex, was preferred in other cases — cf. Lat. *quis tu?* “who goes there?”; *quis clarior Themistocle?*; *quis tu es mulier ...?* —; it was also apt for making inquiries concerning beings of unknown sex and lifeless objects — hence its frequent occurrence in neuter forms: A.Ind. *kim* (which, unlike *kad*, does not serve as an attributive adj. in the RV.), Av. *ciñ*, and similarly in Slav. and Arm. (see Meillet, *Le slave commun*, 1924, p. 442 f.); cf. also Goth. *hwileiks* — and to introduce questions in general (A.Ind. *kim*; Lat. *quid?*; Gr. τί). The indefinite was, therefore, perhaps in most cases, but not exclusively, expressed by *\*k<sup>u</sup>i-*; the interrogative force may (especially in masc. and fem.) have been preferably expressed by *\*k<sup>u</sup>e/o-* (cf. the Avestan usage). That seems to be the most one can say in our present state of knowledge. There is, as far as I am able to see, no reasonable ground for following P. Tedesco (Language, 21, p. 133), according to whom the two themes were originally distributed between the animate and inanimate genders, “who” being *\*k<sup>u</sup>os* and “what” being *\*k<sup>u</sup>id*. The opinion ventured by Vaillant (BSL. 37, p. 103 f.: *\*k<sup>u</sup>i-* comes from an oblique case) is very improbable.

<sup>26)</sup> Delbrück, o.c., I, p. 521; see also the same, Synt. Forschungen I, p. 76.

<sup>27)</sup> Wackernagel, Vorlesungen über Syntax II, p. 110.



historic Indo-European alone in possessing pronouns of this character?

It cannot be said that the points at issue have already been sufficiently illuminated by evidence derived from non-I.E. languages. The few remarks made in this direction by Kretschmer<sup>28)</sup> and Frei<sup>29)</sup> may not induce us to indulge in the thought that such evidence is scanty<sup>30)</sup>. The phenomenon, viz. the 'double function' of the same pronominal element, is, on the contrary, of wide distribution in languages of various families. In contradistinction to those scholars who prefer to explain I.E. facts from I.E. — and even Latin from Latin etc. — the present author is convinced that a careful and well-founded examination of non-I.E. phenomena can render useful services in any research bearing upon syntactic problems of a general character and importance. This has nothing to do with speculations on the assumed psychology of the earliest human beings whose language must have far antedated the earliest stages of the so-called I.E. parent speech, speculations the "absurdity and futility" of which is deservedly denounced by Miss Hahn<sup>31)</sup>. There can be no denying that a comparative study of those syntactic categories and phenomena which occur in all, or many, languages, especially those which may be regarded as being closely bound up with the non-preponderatingly intellectual life or 'pre-scientific' thought of man, that is to say with 'primitivism' — this term being understood in a phenomenological, not in a chronological sense<sup>32)</sup> — reveals to us many points of close resemblance between functions of words or constructions of clauses in various languages<sup>33)</sup>. If it can be shown that there exists, in some

---

<sup>28)</sup> P. Kretschmer, in the *Scritti in onore di A. Trombetti*, Milan 1938, p. 47.

<sup>29)</sup> Frei, *o.c.*, p. 9; 11 f.

<sup>30)</sup> Cf. Schwyzer-Debrunner, *Griech. Gramm.* II, p. 212, n. 4.

<sup>31)</sup> E. A. Hahn, *Subjunctive and optative; their origin as futures*, New York 1953 (*Phil. Mon., Amer. Phil. Ass.* XVI), p. 15, n. 31.

<sup>32)</sup> See e.g. G. van der Leeuw, *Religion in essence and manifestation*, London 1938, esp. p. 683 ff.; the same, *L'homme primitif et la religion*, Paris 1940. It is surprising how radically even cautious attempts to apply phenomenological methods to new provinces of philological research should have been misunderstood by scholars who have accustomed themselves to think only in the traditional terms of chronology.

<sup>33)</sup> A discussion of some syntactic phenomena which may be regarded as resulting from, or as being connected with, the fundamental unity of mankind and the similarity of all men may be found in my article 'Universele

particular points, a high degree of similarity between idioms of different family, and that comparable facts are also found in spoken dialects of modern I.E. languages, no objection can reasonably be made to sound attempts to derive information or to obtain a basis for a hypothesis from them in order to illuminate the genesis, force, or syntactic or stylistic value, of comparable phenomena in ancient I.E. tongues, especially when they may be considered to have originated under comparable cultural circumstances, i.e. when they are found in early and simple documents or in literature of a 'popular' character.

We shall now give a limited and random collection of non-I.E. facts pertinent to the problem under discussion. Commencing with Vietnamese (Annamese) because of the reference made by Kretschmer to the interr.-indef. *ai* occurring in this language, it can be stated that this word, which is usually called the personal interr. pron., is — like the other interrogatives *gi* "what", *đâu* "when" etc. — also used as a so-called indefinite in making statements or asking questions about unidentified specimens etc.<sup>34</sup>). According to Emeneau<sup>35</sup>) "interrogatives have indefinite meaning" in certain contexts, to wit in predications containing negative words, in questions marked as such by other means than interrogative words (e.g. by the final particle *không* which ends questions expecting a yes-or-no answer), "and in some other constructions that are not to be distinguished by syntactic statements from constructions in which the interrogative words have interrogative meaning". Besides, subordinate predications introduced by the conjunction *nếu* "if" and *hễ* "as sure as" also require indefinite meaning for words which elsewhere are interrogative: *hễ<sup>1</sup> có<sup>2</sup> ai<sup>3</sup> đến<sup>4</sup> hỏi<sup>5</sup> tôi<sup>6</sup>, thì<sup>7</sup> anh<sup>8</sup> gọi<sup>9</sup> tôi<sup>10</sup>* "as sure as<sup>1</sup> there is<sup>2</sup> someone<sup>3</sup> who arrives<sup>4</sup> inquires about<sup>5</sup> me<sup>6</sup>, then<sup>7</sup> you<sup>8</sup> call<sup>9</sup> me<sup>10</sup>, i.e. if anyone comes and asks for me, be sure to call me". It is even possible that interrogative words in subordinate members of predications have that force even when they are not in clauses introduced by the above conjunctions. As Emeneau appositely observes no decision can in these cases be made between interrogative and indefinite in literal

tendenzen in de Indonesische syntaxis', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 107 (The Hague 1951), p. 179 ff.

<sup>34</sup>) See M. B. Emeneau, *Studies in Vietnamese (Annamese) grammar*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1951, p. 137.

<sup>35</sup>) Emeneau, o.c., p. 57 ff.

translation: *ai<sup>1</sup> làm<sup>2</sup>, nă'y<sup>3</sup> ăn<sup>4</sup>* ("as a man works, so he eats"): "who<sup>1</sup> works<sup>2</sup>? that one<sup>3</sup> eats<sup>4</sup>, or: anyone<sup>1</sup> works<sup>2</sup>, that one<sup>3</sup> eats<sup>4</sup>". The same scholar therefore rightly asks himself whether the attempt to make a difference is not due to an Indo-European bias; we should perhaps say: a modern I.-E. bias. In Vietnamese a word like *gì* has as its class meaning substitution for a noun with a non-personal reference, and as its substitution type reference to an unidentified specimen. It is only the context which makes it clear whether this reference is intended to stimulate the hearer to identify the specimen or not. In the former case we translate by "what?", in the latter by "any". I would therefore subscribe to Emeneau's suggestion to translate the relevant terms in the following way: "which?/any"; "where?/anywhere" etc. It may, however, be doubted whether we would be right in following the American scholar as far as his terminology is concerned: is it correct to adopt the practice of Indo-European scholars suggesting that these words are interrogative in character and under certain circumstances used as indefinites?

There is no denying that these facts are very similar to phenomena occurring in other, I.E. and non-I.E., languages. It would appear that a large part of the considerations to which we are induced by these pronouns in Vietnamese — and in other languages in which they show the same characteristics — can be made fruitful for a better understanding of comparable phenomena in Indo-European. We can indeed be scarcely in doubt that a closer examination of the relevant facts will bring to light a similar "who?/some (one)" character of these pronouns in other idioms, the grammarians of which usually content themselves with the formulation that the interrogative pronouns also do duty for indefinites <sup>36</sup>).

When accompanied by a negation many Indonesian words which under other circumstances can express the ideas of "who?, what? etc." bear an indefinite force. In Malay, *siapa* alone means "who?", and *sěorañ* or *sěsěorañ* (*sě-* "a, one"; *orañ* "human being") "somebody, an individual human being"; but "nobody" is not only rendered by *sěorañ* (*pun*) *tiada* (*tiada* "not"), but also by *tiada siapa*; *apa* =

<sup>36</sup>) See, for instance, G. J. Ramstedt, *Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft*, Helsinki 1952, p. 80; H. Costenoble, *Die Chamoro Sprache*, The Hague 1940, p. 228; H. Jørgensen, *A grammar of the classical Newari*, Copenhagen 1941, p. 39.

"what?", *apa-apa* "something, anything, any, aught", but *tiada apa* means "nothing", *tiada apa-apa* "nothing at all". In Minangkabau *sia*, which serves as an interrogative pronoun ("who?"), can also stand for our "whoever" and, in combination with a negative particle, for "nobody". In negative clauses and in constructions which may conveniently be called subordinate (e.g. *baso<sup>1</sup> siap<sup>2</sup> kòh<sup>3</sup> ura<sup>4</sup> ka<sup>5</sup> mati<sup>6</sup>* "I fear<sup>1</sup> that one<sup>2</sup> (person<sup>4</sup>) of us<sup>2</sup> shall<sup>5</sup> die<sup>6</sup>" (*kòh* expresses doubt). In Achehnese, *sòë* is, on the one hand, used as an interrogative pronoun: *sòë ku gata* "who is your father (*ku*)?"; *rumòh sòë nyan* "whose house (*r.*) is that?", and, on the other hand, an indefinite word: *na sòë sakét?* "is anyone ill (*s.*)?" (*na*: "to be, to exist"); *bè' sòë tamòn* "nobody should enter" (*bè*: the Gr. *μή*). It can also express the idea of "whoever, whatever, all that". In other cases it is often regarded as a relative pronoun: *le sòë tulôn* can indeed be translated by "there are many (*le*) who help (*t.*)", but "many are those-who help, helpers are many" comes nearer to the original. In cases like this we may perhaps call the function of the pronoun indefinite-determinative <sup>37)</sup>. There exists a considerable correspondence between this Achehnese word and the Gayo *si* with which it is etymologically identical: accompanied by a negative particle *si* (*sih, sihôn*) has, in the first place, a significance almost equivalent to an indefinite pronoun. As an interrogative it inquires after one or more persons or objects belonging to a limited number, or, rather, after the relation in which that person or object stands to the other constituents of a whole. In *sa* (*sah* etc.) the same language possesses a pronominal word which occurs in questions requiring the hearer to identify a person; accompanied by *göri* "not" it means "nobody". In Sundanese (Java) *naon* means "what?", but *tö naon* "that is nothing" (*tö* "not, nothing") and *tö aya naon* "there is nothing" (*aya* "(to) exist, (to) be"). Beside *sabaraha* "how much, how many?" in interrogative sentences we find *hantö sabaraha* "not worth while, little, few" (*hantö* "not, without"). This word, moreover, goes with similar terms in other Indonesian idioms in that it bears the same indefinite force in clauses like *najan<sup>1</sup> sabaraha<sup>2</sup> lawas<sup>3</sup> na<sup>4</sup>* "even if<sup>1</sup> any (number, however much)<sup>2</sup> space of time<sup>3</sup> of it<sup>4</sup>", i.e. "even if it would take a long time" <sup>38)</sup>. Similarly, in other I.N. languages;

<sup>37)</sup> For the determinative function see *Lingua* IV, p. 25.

<sup>38)</sup> Cf. also S. J. Esser, *Klank- en vormleer van het Morisch, Verhande-*

cf. e.g. the Bolaang-Mongondow (*ki*) *ine* "who?/whoever": *ki ine<sup>1</sup> i muna<sup>2</sup> ko<sup>3</sup> naa<sup>4</sup>, yo<sup>5</sup> sia<sup>6</sup> i<sup>7</sup> moko-untun<sup>8</sup>* "whoever<sup>1</sup> first<sup>2</sup> (at<sup>3</sup>) here<sup>4</sup>, (then<sup>5</sup>) he<sup>6</sup> the one who<sup>7</sup> has won<sup>8</sup>" <sup>39</sup>). In Cham *thěi* fulfils both functions, as the type of sentence in which it occurs may require. Comparable relations between indef. and interr. pronouns exist, for instance, in Khasi <sup>40</sup>), Turkish, etc. Authors of grammars sometimes notice "a confusion" in the use of these two categories of pronouns, "one being used in place of the other" <sup>41</sup>). Or they inform us that there are, in the idiom described, no regular indefinite (and relative) pronouns, the interrogatives being commonly used in their place <sup>42</sup>).

A striking feature of these elements when bearing an indefinite force is the frequent duplication of their outward form. Indonesian instances are very numerous: in Malay *mana* means "where, which?", *dimana-mana* "everywhere"; in Malay, Minangkabau, and other languages *apa* means "somewhat; what, which?", *apa-apa* "something, whatever, anything"; in Ngaju-Dyak (Borneo): *äwe* "who?": *äwe-äwe* "whoever, anybody"; in Busang (Borneo) *hi* "who?; somebody"; *hi-hi* beside *hi* (which also occurs in negative sentences) "whoever". Side by side with the Mori (Celebes) *ba hapa* "what", which is interr. and indef., the geminated *ba hapa<sup>2</sup>* "enhances the indef. character of the phrase" <sup>43</sup>). In Sangirese (north of Celebes), *isain* "who?": *i sai-sain* "everybody"; in Banggai (east of Celebes) *ilee*, which is often used in an interr. sense, can also express the idea of "whoever", but

---

lingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap v. K. en Wet., 67, 3, 1937, p. 158 (§ 201).

<sup>39</sup>) It is a matter for regret that most authors of grammars have failed to report exactly the cases in which these indefinite functions are used. See e.g. W. Dunnebier, *Spraakkunst van het Bolaang Mongondowsch*, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volk.* 86, p. 125; Costenoble, o.c., p. 228 f.

<sup>40</sup>) See H. Roberts, *A grammar of the Khasi language*, London 1891, p. 45.

<sup>41</sup>) E.g. T. N. Dave, *A study of the Gujarati language*, London 1935, p. 34.

<sup>42</sup>) E.g. D. L. R. Lorimer, *The Āumāki language*, Nimeguen 1939, p. 83; T. G. Bailey, *Grammar of the Shina language*, London 1924, p. 62. The Shina indef. occurs in negative and subordinate clauses; *kō* "who?": *kō nūsh* (*n.* "is not") "there was no one". — For interesting interrelations see also S. K. Chatterji, *The origin and development of the Bengali language*, Calcutta 1926, p. 842; G. V. Tagare, *History of Apabhramśa*, Poona 1948, p. 256.

<sup>43</sup>) Esser, o.c., p. 159.

in that case it is mostly duplicated <sup>44</sup>); in Macassar, Gayo <sup>45</sup>), Sundanese, and other languages one might find various parallels. The indeterminate, distributive, collective or general force often borne by geminated forms <sup>46</sup>) can be of such a vagueness and indetermination as to meet the want of expressions for all shades of pronominal indefiniteness. But the indefinite character of the geminated form may not suggest considering a priori the simple form to be an interrogative <sup>47</sup>).

The addition of one or more particles to that pronominal stem which by itself can convey the interrogative meaning is another device of wide distribution. In Japanese *tare* means "who?", *tare ka* "somebody" in sentences like the following: *tare ga kita ka* "who has come?" (*ka*: interr. particle) and *tare ka ga kita* "someone has come" respectively <sup>48</sup>). Although, in Newārī, the relevant forms are interrogative and indefinite in character, the latter meaning is in most cases expressed by the pronoun and a suffix; when the pronoun alone is used in an indef. sense, the suffix is frequently added to other words in the sentence <sup>49</sup>). In the Dravidian languages the indefinite, according to the formulation chosen by Bloch <sup>50</sup>), "se forme sur l'interrogatif, en y ajoutant: 1°. une particule de doute; 2°. une particule signifiant "même". In the Indonesian Sangirese we find *i saiewen* "whoever" beside *isain* (indef.), *i sai-sain* "anybody", *i sai* "who?" <sup>51</sup>). In Bare'e (Celebes) *i sema* is "who", *bara i sema* or *bara i sema*<sup>2</sup> "whoever" (*bara* "perhaps") <sup>52</sup>). In Buginese (Celebes) gemination and the addition of

<sup>44</sup>) I refer to J. D. van den Bergh, *Spraak-kunst van het Banggais*, The Hague 1953, p. 73.

<sup>45</sup>) See G. A. J. Hazeu, *Gajösch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek*, Batavia 1907, p. 755.

<sup>46</sup>) See my paper 'The functions of word duplication ...', *Lingua* II, p. 170 ff.

<sup>47</sup>) It would be worth while exactly to determine the types of clauses in which the different forms occur, their position among other words etc.

<sup>48</sup>) For particulars see G. Sansom, *An historical grammar of Japanese*, Oxford 1928, p. 75 ff.

<sup>49</sup>) See Jørgensen, o.c., p. 40.

<sup>50</sup>) J. Bloch, *Structure grammaticale des langues dravidiennes*, Paris 1946, p. 22; cf. e.g. also J. Vinson, *Manuel de la langue tamoule*, Paris 1903, p. 84.

<sup>51</sup>) For particulars see N. Adriani, *Sangireesche Spraakkunst*, Leyden 1893, p. 247; 251 f.

<sup>52</sup>) I refer to Adriani, *Spraak-kunst der Bare'e-taal*, Bandung 1931, p. 359.

particles of a similar significance are resorted to: *aga* "what?"; *aga*<sup>2</sup> and *bara-aga* "whatever" <sup>53</sup>). The Karo-Batak (Sumatra) *tah isé* means "whoever": *isé* "who", *tah* being a conjunctive element expressing doubt, uncertainty etc. In the African Duala "werden die Indefinita von den Fragepronomen gebildet durch Beifügung von *to*" <sup>54</sup>). It will be evident that the greater the choice of additional elements the greater the opportunity to express various shades of indefinite meanings: Mal. *barañ apa*, *apa pun*, *apa juga*, etc.

Now the same additional elements can often also combine with non-pronominal words, e.g. with words for "human being", which are often equivalent to our indefinites (e.g. Bare'e *tau* "human being; somebody, one", Fr. "on"): Mal. *barañ sě-orañ* "some one or other". As the Mal. *orañ* is no interrogative <sup>55</sup>), the conclusion must be that words like *barañ* cannot be said to transform an interrogative word into an indefinite <sup>56</sup>). Besides, a construction like *siapa*<sup>1</sup> *datān*<sup>2</sup> "who<sup>1</sup> comes<sup>2</sup>?" or *tiada siapa datān* "nobody comes" is complete in itself, but *siapa*<sup>2</sup> *datān*, *barañ siapa d.*, *siapa juga d.* "whoever comes" are not: after these word groups the sentence is continued. So the function of the pronouns depends on the context in which they occur; these additional elements serve to emphasize the indefinite force or to indicate some slight difference or delicate distinction <sup>57</sup>), other particles (-*tah*, -*kah*) fulfilling a similar function in interrogative sentences: *siapakah*<sup>1</sup> *anak*<sup>2</sup> *itu*<sup>3</sup>? "Who<sup>1</sup> is that<sup>3</sup> child<sup>2</sup>?" <sup>58</sup>).

To the gemination and the frequent and wide-spread combinations of pronouns and particles special interest attaches in connection with

<sup>53</sup>) For particulars see B. F. Matthes, *Boegineesche Spraakkunst*, Amsterdam 1875, p. 203.

<sup>54</sup>) C. Meinhof, *Grundzüge einer vergl. Grammatik der Bantusprachen*<sup>2</sup>, Hamburg 1948, p. 93.

<sup>55</sup>) It is interesting to note that I.N. words for "human being" can combine with elements bearing an interrogative force to form phrases for "what sort of (man)?, what (nationality) is he? etc.": Bare'e *to-kuja* (*to* < *tau*), *tau to-kuja*, etc.

<sup>56</sup>) In connection with numerals *barañ* like *τις* in Greek stands for our "some".

<sup>57</sup>) For a discussion of these particles see A. A. Fokker, *Inleiding tot de studie van de Indonesische [= Modern Malay] syntaxis*, Groningen-Djakarta 1951, p. 55 f.

<sup>58</sup>) These elements are also used when a question cannot be indicated either by context or intonation.

the close parallelism of the corresponding Indo-European forms: Lat. *quisque, quisquam*; Germ. *wer auch, wer immer*; AInd. *kaś cana, ko'pi* "somebody etc.". Some scholars explicitly attribute the indefinite force to the particle: thus Debrunner-Wackernagel<sup>59)</sup> who even speak of an "indefinitierende Partikel". Others, among whom was Brugmann, seem to regard the particle as less essential: "eine den indefiniten Sinn verstärkenden Partikel"<sup>60)</sup>. We need not concern ourselves here with those phrases which, being modelled on ancient examples, are evidently of a more recent origin: (Skt. *ko'pi*; Eng. *whatever* "what (with additional emphasis)", etc.<sup>61)</sup>. Focussing attention mainly on the group *\*k<sup>ue</sup>-/k<sup>uo</sup>-* and *\*k<sup>ui</sup>-* we must in the first place observe that the view pronounced by Delbrück, Brugmann, Walde, and other scholars<sup>62)</sup> that Lat. *quisque*, Goth. *hazuh*, the very rare AInd. *kaś ca, kim ca*, and (according to some scholars also) the Gr.: *τίς τε* are genetically identical, can no longer be maintained. Referring for an ample discussion of the relevant facts to another paper<sup>63)</sup>, it will suffice here to state, by way of recapitulation, that a Greek counterpart of *quisque* < *\*k<sup>ui</sup>- + \*k<sup>ue</sup>* does not, as far as we are able to see, exist; that the Goth. *hazuh* impresses us as having arisen in special syntactic positions, especially in sentences of a virtually conditional sense and in pairs of clauses of a complementary-antithetical character — in both cases there is an abundance of reasons to believe that *-uh* < *-\*k<sup>ue</sup>* originally and essentially conveyed that very complementary force —; that the Lat. *quisque* owes its origin mainly to the frequent occurrence of the particle *-que* < *-\*k<sup>ue</sup>* in definite types of relative sentences which — as has been shown by Miss Hotz<sup>64)</sup> — coincidentally often contained the likewise enclitic pronoun *quis* (= *τίς*)<sup>65)</sup>.

<sup>59)</sup> Debrunner-Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* III, p. 570.

<sup>60)</sup> Brugmann, *Grundriss*<sup>2</sup> II, 2, p. 352.

<sup>61)</sup> For Anc.Ind. *ko'pi* see Debrunner-Wackernagel, o.c., III, p. 571.

<sup>62)</sup> Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, I, p. 515 f.; II, p. 511 ff.; Brugmann, *Grundriss*<sup>2</sup>, II, 2, p. 352; Walde-Pokorny, *Vergl. Wtb.* I, p. 507; S. Feist, *Vergl. Wtb. d. gotischen Sprache*<sup>3</sup> (1939), p. 283 f.; Debrunner-Wackernagel, o.c., p. 571; Walde-Hofmann, *Lat. etym. Wtb.*<sup>3</sup> II, p. 410.

<sup>63)</sup> J. Gonda, *The history and original function of the I.-E. particle k<sup>ue</sup> especially in Greek and Latin*, Mnemosyne, 1954.

<sup>64)</sup> L. Hotz, *Die Enklisenstellung des Pronomens quisque*, Thesis Zürich 1941.

<sup>65)</sup> For Av. *čišča* see Debrunner-Wackernagel, o.c., III, p. 571.



If we are, in the main, not mistaken in modifying the results of previous research, it follows that it was not *\*k<sup>ue</sup>* which transformed an interrogative pronoun into an indefinite, but that an essentially indefinite pronoun was in various ways extended by the enclitic particle *\*k<sup>ue</sup>* <sup>66</sup>).

It is worthy of special notice that this indefinite character should show itself, inter alia, in explicitly or virtually 'relative' clauses. We may corroborate the above inference by pointing to the frequent Vedic and also post-Vedic phrases of the type *yá- ká- ca* "who (what) ever" (*ye ke ca* "any persons whatsoever"; *yasyai kasyai ca devatāyai* "to any deity whatsoever") and use it, in its turn, to explain the remarkable, and at first sight even strange, rarity of the combination *ka- ca*, *kiṃ ca* in Ancient Indian <sup>67</sup>).

The more I consider the well-known idiom *ya- ka- ca* — which is also represented in the adverbs of the ancient language — the less I feel inclined to adhere to the communis opinio, according to which *ca* converts the interrogative pronoun to an indefinite meaning <sup>68</sup>). Nor am I completely convinced of the correctness of the view <sup>69</sup>) that *ya- ka- ca* owes its origin to a combination of the "relative pronoun" and the indefinite *ka- ca*. Reserving the other representative of the idiom for further consideration in a subsequent part of this article it must be observed here that — however much the three components form, in historical times, unity (cf. also the Avestan *yō čišca*) and however 'indefinite' the sense of the combination may be — the original function of the particle *ca* seems to be more or less apparent in many passages. Starting from the hypothesis that *\*k<sup>ue</sup>* essentially served to express complementary connection <sup>70</sup>) such texts as R.V.

<sup>66</sup>) For other ancient phrases with *\*k<sup>ue</sup>-/k<sup>uo</sup>-*, *\*k<sup>ui</sup>-* see p. 262 ff.

<sup>67</sup>) I refer to Debrunner-Wackernagel, o.c., III, p. 571, and, for the accentuation, to p. 568 f. The instance quoted by these authors is of special interest: JaimUpBr. 1, 57, 2 *bahu<sup>1</sup> vai kiṃ<sup>2</sup> ca<sup>3</sup> kiṃ<sup>4</sup> ca<sup>5</sup> pumāṃś<sup>6</sup> carati<sup>7</sup>* "a man<sup>6</sup> does<sup>7</sup> many<sup>1</sup> things<sup>1</sup>, something<sup>2</sup> on the one hand, something<sup>4</sup> on the other hand<sup>5</sup>", i.e. "a man does many and various things".

<sup>68</sup>) See W. D. Whitney, A Sanskrit grammar, § 507; Renou, Grammaire sanscrite, Paris 1930, p. 378.

<sup>69</sup>) Cf. Speyer, Sanskrit syntax, p. 214 f.; Ved. u. Sanskrit Syntax, p. 42; A. A. Macdonell, Vedic grammar, Strassburg 1910, p. 304; Debrunner-Wackernagel, o.c., III, p. 571 f.

<sup>70</sup>) I refer to my article on the particle *\*k<sup>ue</sup>* (see n. 63).

6, 46, 8 *yád<sup>1</sup> vā<sup>2</sup> tṛkṣaú<sup>3</sup> maghavan<sup>4</sup> druhydv<sup>5</sup> d<sup>6</sup> jáne<sup>7</sup> yát<sup>8</sup> pūrau<sup>9</sup> kác<sup>10</sup> ca<sup>11</sup> vṛṣṇyam<sup>12</sup> | asmábhyam<sup>13</sup> tád<sup>14</sup> rirīhi<sup>15</sup>* “or<sup>2</sup> the virility<sup>12</sup> which<sup>1</sup>, O bountiful One<sup>4</sup>, is with Tṛkṣi<sup>3</sup>, or with<sup>6</sup> the Druhyu<sup>5</sup> people<sup>7</sup>, and<sup>11</sup> whatever<sup>8</sup>, <sup>10</sup> is with the Puru<sup>9</sup> (people), grant<sup>15</sup> us<sup>13</sup> that<sup>14</sup>,” may be compared to RV. 6, 75, 19 *yó<sup>1</sup> naḥ<sup>2</sup> svó<sup>3</sup> draṇo<sup>4</sup> yás<sup>5</sup> ca<sup>6</sup> níṣṭyo<sup>7</sup> jighāmsati<sup>8</sup> | devás<sup>9</sup> tám<sup>10</sup> sárve<sup>11</sup> dhūrvantu<sup>12</sup>* “if<sup>1</sup> a man of our own ‘clan’<sup>3</sup> (or) an outsider<sup>4</sup> or<sup>6</sup> if<sup>5</sup> a foreigner<sup>7</sup> wishes to kill<sup>8</sup> us<sup>2</sup>, all<sup>11</sup> the gods<sup>9</sup> must bring<sup>12</sup> him to<sup>10</sup> ruin<sup>12</sup>”; AV. 7, 70, 1 *yát<sup>1</sup> kíṃ<sup>2</sup> cā<sup>3</sup> sai<sup>4</sup> mánasā<sup>5</sup> yác<sup>6</sup> ca<sup>7</sup> vācā<sup>8</sup> yajñatr<sup>9</sup> juhóti<sup>10</sup> havīṣā<sup>11</sup> yájuṣā<sup>12</sup> | tád<sup>13</sup>* ... “whatsoever<sup>1. 2</sup> (on the one hand<sup>3</sup>) he yonder<sup>4</sup> offers<sup>10</sup> with mind<sup>5</sup>, and<sup>7</sup> what<sup>6</sup> (on the other hand<sup>7</sup>) with voice<sup>8</sup>, with sacrifices<sup>9</sup>, with oblation<sup>11</sup>, with sacred formula<sup>12</sup>, that<sup>13</sup> ...” may be regarded as representing a *ya- ca ... ya- ca* construction as occurs, for instance, in AV. 11, 10, 22 *yás<sup>1</sup> ca<sup>2</sup> kavac<sup>3</sup> yás<sup>4</sup> cā<sup>5</sup> kāvacaḥ<sup>6</sup>* “who(ever)<sup>1</sup> is mailed<sup>3</sup> and<sup>5</sup> who<sup>4</sup> is without mail<sup>6</sup>”, in which *ca ... ca* likewise emphasize the idea of complementary connection. Cf. also AV. 6, 50, 3 *yá<sup>1</sup> āraṇyā<sup>2</sup> vyadvārā<sup>3</sup> yé<sup>4</sup> ké<sup>5</sup> ca<sup>6</sup> sthā<sup>7</sup> vyadvārās<sup>8</sup> tán<sup>9</sup>* ... “what<sup>1</sup> devourers<sup>3</sup> (there are) of the forest<sup>2</sup>, and<sup>6</sup> whatever<sup>4. 5</sup> (other) devourers<sup>8</sup> you are<sup>7</sup>, them<sup>9</sup> ...”; AV. 4, 22, 6 where *ya- ka- ca* forms part of an antithetical clause: *úttaras<sup>1</sup> tvám<sup>2</sup> ádhare<sup>3</sup> te<sup>4</sup> sapátnā<sup>5</sup> yé<sup>6</sup> ké<sup>7</sup> ca<sup>8</sup> rájan<sup>9</sup> prátisatravas<sup>10</sup> te<sup>11</sup>* “superior<sup>1</sup> (are) you<sup>2</sup>, inferior<sup>3</sup> your<sup>4</sup> rivals<sup>5</sup>, whosoever<sup>6. 7</sup>, O king<sup>9</sup>, are (on the other hand<sup>8</sup>) your “opposing enemies<sup>10</sup>” <sup>71</sup>); AV. 5, 23, 5 *yé<sup>1</sup> krímayas<sup>2</sup> śitivákṣā<sup>3</sup> yé<sup>4</sup> kṛṣṇāḥ<sup>5</sup> śitibdhavaḥ<sup>6</sup> | yé<sup>7</sup> ké<sup>8</sup> ca<sup>9</sup> viśvārūpās<sup>10</sup> tán<sup>11</sup> krímīm<sup>12</sup> jambhayāmasi<sup>13</sup>* “the worms<sup>2</sup> which<sup>1</sup> have white sides<sup>3</sup>, (those) which<sup>4</sup> are black<sup>5</sup> with white arms<sup>6</sup>, and<sup>9</sup> whatever ones<sup>7. 8</sup> (are) of all forms<sup>10</sup> — those<sup>11</sup> worms<sup>12</sup> we grind up<sup>13</sup>”; and passages like RV. 10, 19, 7 *yé<sup>1</sup> devāḥ<sup>2</sup> ké<sup>3</sup> ca<sup>4</sup> yajñiās<sup>5</sup> té<sup>6</sup> rayyā<sup>7</sup> sám<sup>8</sup> sṛjantu<sup>9</sup> naḥ<sup>10</sup>* “(those) gods<sup>2</sup>, whosoever<sup>1. 3. 4</sup> (they are), who are worthy of worship<sup>5</sup>, (they<sup>6</sup>) must present<sup>8. 9</sup> as<sup>10</sup> with possessions<sup>7</sup>”, where a reference to divinities who are not worthy of worship (cf. RV. 10, 124, 3) may be implied or supplied; AitBr. 4, 18, 7 *sarvam<sup>1</sup> eve<sup>2</sup> dam<sup>3</sup> atirocate<sup>4</sup> yad<sup>5</sup> idaṃ<sup>6</sup> kiṃ<sup>7</sup> ca<sup>8</sup>* “he surpasses<sup>4</sup> all<sup>1. 2</sup> this<sup>3</sup> in shining<sup>4</sup> whatever<sup>5. 7. 8</sup> (there is) here<sup>6</sup>”, the idea of here

<sup>71</sup>) In this connection it seems worth remembering that in German (*doch*, which contains \**kue*, see O. Behaghel, *Deutsche Syntax*, III, p. 155 ff.) and, as would appear to the present author, also in Greek (see the article referred to in n. 63), the particle \**kue* can also appear in a subordinate clause belonging to an antithetical main clause.

possibly suggesting a correspondent "yonder"; 5, 7, 3 *imān*<sup>1</sup> *vai*<sup>2</sup> *lokān*<sup>3</sup> *prajāpatiḥ*<sup>4</sup> *sṛṣṭve*<sup>5</sup> *daṃ*<sup>6</sup> *sarvam*<sup>7</sup> *aśakno*<sup>8</sup> *yad*<sup>9</sup> *idaṃ*<sup>10</sup> *kim*<sup>11</sup> *ca*<sup>12</sup> "having created<sup>5</sup> these worlds<sup>3</sup> Prajāpati<sup>4</sup> had<sup>8</sup> all<sup>7</sup> power<sup>8</sup> (to bring about) this<sup>6</sup> whatever<sup>9, 11, 12</sup> (there is) here<sup>10</sup>"; Āśv. Gs. 1, 3, 1 *yatra*<sup>1</sup> *kva*<sup>2</sup> *ca*<sup>3</sup> *hoṣyant*<sup>4</sup> *syād*<sup>5</sup> ... "wenn<sup>1</sup> er<sup>1</sup> irgendwo<sup>2, 3</sup> opfern will<sup>4, 5</sup>" (Stenzler) which may represent an 'original' "anywhere<sup>2</sup> (at any particular spot<sup>2</sup> of a 'local whole'<sup>3</sup>) where<sup>1</sup> he is to sacrifice<sup>4, 5</sup> ..." <sup>72</sup>); AitBr. 2, 23, 7 *tasmāt*<sup>1</sup> *tasya*<sup>2</sup> *yata*<sup>3</sup> *eva*<sup>4</sup> *kutaś*<sup>5</sup> *ca*<sup>6</sup> *prāśnīyāt*<sup>7</sup> "therefore<sup>1</sup> should he eat<sup>7</sup> from any part whatever<sup>3-6</sup> of it<sup>2</sup>", etc. etc. <sup>73</sup>).

### III

Are we justified in making the addition of particles etc. to the indefinites a point in favour of the assumption that they came into existence after the interrogatives <sup>74</sup>? I am inclined to answer this question in the negative. In many languages this addition obviously serves to emphasize and intensify the indefinite force inherent in the pronoun, or also to qualify it, to indicate varieties of indefiniteness. Cf., in Malay *barang siapa* "whoever" (b. meaning "thing, stuff, wares, something"); *siapa juga* "id." (j.: "in a way, all the same"); Sangir *i sajewen*, and many other IN. forms; in the Dravidian Kūi *vē* gives, in a comparable way, emphasis: "(anything etc.) whatever" <sup>75</sup>; and similarly, in Singhalese, in Khasi, and in many other languages. Not infrequently such combinations are only intelligible if we consider them as conditioned by the original indefinite character of the pronominal element contained in them. Thus the Lat. *aliquis* "somebody

<sup>72</sup>) May we here recall the frequent use of *re* after *iva*, *ēvθα* and other local conjunctions in ancient Greek (see the article referred to in n. 63, part II), and the Latin *ubi quisque* (ibidem, part II)?

<sup>73</sup>) It is my intention before long to sketch the history of the particle *ca* in Indo-Iranian in a separate article, which probably will appear in the Annals of Oriental Research, University of Madras. — Cf., in the Avesta, Y. 45, 5; special attention may be drawn to Y. 43, 16 where *yas* ... *čiščā* is followed by a 'superlative' *spēništō*, reminding us of the Homeric construction: ε 4 οὗ τε κρείττος ἐστὶ μέγιστον; I 39 ὃ τε κ. ε. μ. For *ya-* see *Lingua*, IV, p. 9 ff.

<sup>74</sup>) See: H. Schuchardt, in the *Analecta Graeciensia*, Graz 1893, p. 205; P. Kretschmer, in the *Scritti in onore di A. Trombetti*, Milan 1938, p. 46 ff.

<sup>75</sup>) See J. E. Friend-Pereira, *A grammar of the Kūi language*, Calcutta 1909, p. 41.

(no matter who), irgend Jemand, — einer", the first component of which conveys the sense of "(an)other"<sup>76</sup>): this indefinite, with which we may compare the Gr. *ἄλλο τι* and *τις ἄλλος* "any other", can in its turn, be 'intensified' by *alius*: *aliud aliquid* etc.; cf. also Toch. A *ālya-k*, B *alye-k* "*ἄλλος τις*"<sup>77</sup>); — cf. also Lat. *quīvis* "jeder beliebige" (*vis* "you wish, want")<sup>78</sup>), *quīlibet*, and Umbr. *pis-her* (her from *her-* "velle") from the indef. relat. use (Plaut. M. G. 358 *loquere quidevis* (or *quid vis*); Curc. 38 *ama quid lubet*) —; Lat. *quisquam* < *quis* and *quam* "irgendwie"; the similar AInd. *kaścid* etc. which, perhaps, in the early texts might sometimes be translated: "somebody in some way (somewhat etc.)": RV. 1, 37, 13; 87, 2; 173, 11<sup>79</sup>).

Miss Hahn<sup>80</sup>) seems to be right in concluding that the lines drawn between the different Latin indefinite pronouns in the classic texts are not natural to the language in general; originally they must have been mere by-forms of *quis*, not too highly specialized; hence the 'confusions' and 'interchanges' in popular speech and in the literary languages of later times<sup>81</sup>). The reduplicated form, represented by *quisquis*, is typical of indefinites<sup>82</sup>). In a generalizing relative sense it replaced the simple *quis*, which e.g. Plaut. Merc. 991 could express that very shade of meaning; besides, it is distributive: Plaut. Most. 831. I am, however, under the impression that Miss Hahn is too much inclined to believe that the exact outward similarity of the Italic

<sup>76</sup>) The reader may, for the sake of brevity, consult Walde-Hofmann, Lat. etym. Wtb.<sup>3</sup>, I, p. 30 f.; Ernout-Meillet, Dict. étym.<sup>3</sup>, p. 38 f.; Gonda, Reflections on the numerals "one" and "two", p. 56 ff.

<sup>77</sup>) Cf. Pedersen, Le groupement des dial. i.-eur., Danske vid. selsk., h.-f. medd. 11, 3, Copenhagen 1925, p. 26.

<sup>78</sup>) See e.g. Wackernagel, Vorl. über Syntax<sup>3</sup>, II, p. 120; 125.

<sup>79</sup>) See above, p. 256 ff. — For Celtic see Pedersen, o.c., II, § 528. — Cf. also Germ. *irgendein*; Eng. *anyone* etc.

<sup>80</sup>) Hahn, in the Tr. and Pr. Amer. Phil. Ass. 64 (1903), p. 34 f.

<sup>81</sup>) See also Hofmann, Lat. Gramm.<sup>3</sup>, p. 482 ff.; J. Marouzeau, Quelques aspects de la formation du latin littéraire, Paris 1949, p. 21 ff.; W. Kroll, in the Glotta, 6, p. 355 f.; R. Methner, *ibid.* 4, p. 281 ff.

<sup>82</sup>) Cf. also Hofmann, Lat. Umgangssprache<sup>3</sup>, Heidelberg 1936, p. 59 f.; Gonda, The functions of word duplication, *Lingua*, II, p. 170 ff., esp. p. 177; and such instances as the Khasi *ka-mo-ka-mo-rak*, *wa-mo-wa-rak* "any one", the idea of distribution being very often expressed by the mere repetition of the pronoun. For Greek (Arg.) *toti*; see Schwyzler-Debrunner, o.c. I, p. 217. For Hitt. *taš taš*; Friedrich, o.c., p. 114.

and Hittite forms can only mean that they already were part and parcel of the 'Ursprache'. It would indeed be a curious coincidence — Miss Hahn herself even calls it a riddle — that not only Hitt. *kuiš* and Lat. *quis*, but also *kuiš kuiš*: *quisquis*, *kuiša*: *quisque*, *kuiški*: *quisquam*, which correspond "with amazing closeness", should have remained unaltered in both branches of I.E. during many centuries, whereas on the other hand the historical I.E. languages show a rather varied succession of pronominal forms and functions. There seems therefore to be reason for some reserve<sup>83</sup>). Gemination being a device of very wide distribution such forms as *quisquis* are, especially in 'pre-scientific' milieus — part of the doubled word forms were for their 'popular' character avoided in classic Latin — apt to turn up independently. Cases like the Gr. *τίς τε* and the Lat. *quisque* which do not correspond in function<sup>84</sup>) show that the outward identity of a sequence or word group not necessarily implies original identity in formation. So, while Delbrück's<sup>85</sup>) attempt to trace *quisquis* to *\*īos k<sup>u</sup>is* (cf. *δοτις*) fails to consider the ancient relative function of *\*k<sup>u</sup>is*, it would on the other hand be incautious to regard the indef. rel. use of *quisquis* — *kuiš kuiš* as belonging to Orig. I.E. An indef. rel. *quisquis* can also, and, it would appear to me, for the time being more prudently, be conceived as having sprung from a pre-existent relative *quis*, the more so as the same word in a non-rel. indef. sense may have exerted influence.

It would, in my opinion, be a more satisfactory view to hold that originally neither the addition of *\*k<sup>u</sup>e* to the pronominal stem, nor its being geminated, nor other such modifications, were obligatory. If and whenever they occurred they imparted a special shade of meaning to the clause or word group. They could, mainly for stylistical reasons, 'interchange'<sup>86</sup>). That is to say: it must have been largely at the choice of the speaker to use any or none of these 'by-forms'. Traces of this 'free usage' are far from rare in early Latin texts: *quis*, though already regular after *si*, *ne*, *num*, is frequently found

<sup>83</sup>) As to *quisque*: *kuiša* scholars disagree: see my paper on the particle *\*k<sup>u</sup>e*: Mnemosyne, part II.

<sup>84</sup>) Cf. Mnemosyne, part II. For (AInd. *kaśca*), Av. *čišca* see also Meillet, Mém. Soc. Ling. 10, p. 272, and above, p. 256.

<sup>85</sup>) Delbrück, Vergl. Syntax, III, p. 404.

<sup>86</sup>) Cf. also such cases as *ὄς τε* 'instead of *δοτις*': Mnemosyne, N.S. vol. VII.

without these words, *quisque* and *quisquis* are often interchangeable, *quisquam* is also used in affirmative sentences <sup>87)</sup>. These very fluctuations seem to be an argument for the hypothesis.

## IV

Returning now to the I.E. *\*k<sup>uo</sup>e-/k<sup>uo</sup>o-*, *\*k<sup>ui</sup>i-* in general it may be remembered that the mere forms deriving from them <sup>88)</sup> can, as a rule, be used in an indefinite sense, but mainly in special constructions, to wit broadly speaking, in negative and interrogative sentences and in subordinate clauses (relative clauses and clauses introduced by definite conjunctions).

In connection with a negative particle these stems are indefinite <sup>89)</sup>. Thus we find in Anc. Indian: *nákiḥ* "nullus; nihil; non" (*kiḥ* encl.), and *mā ká-* (*ká-* accentuated): e.g. RV. 8, 32, 15 *nákir<sup>1</sup> asya<sup>2</sup> śácīnām<sup>3</sup> niyantā<sup>4</sup>* "nobody<sup>1</sup> will check<sup>4</sup> the renderings<sup>3</sup> of his<sup>2</sup> mighty help<sup>3</sup>"; 7, 94, 8 *mā<sup>1</sup> kásya<sup>2</sup> no<sup>3</sup> draruṣo<sup>4</sup> dhūrtih<sup>5</sup> prdñan<sup>6</sup> mārtyasya<sup>7</sup>* "the malice<sup>5</sup> of an (any)<sup>2</sup> unfriendly<sup>4</sup> man<sup>7</sup> shall<sup>6</sup> not<sup>1</sup> fall<sup>6</sup> upon us<sup>3</sup>"; and, with the privative *a-*, such words as *akutaḥ* "not from any quarter" beside *kutaḥ?* "from where, whence?"; in Avestan: Y. 31, 18 *mā<sup>1</sup> čiš<sup>2</sup> at<sup>3</sup> vā<sup>4</sup> dragvatō<sup>5</sup> maθraṣ<sup>6</sup> ... gūštā<sup>7</sup>* "none<sup>1, 2</sup> of you<sup>4</sup> shall listen<sup>7</sup> to the words<sup>6</sup> of the wicked man<sup>5</sup>". Cf. also OChSl. *nikū komuže* "nicht zu irgend jemand"; *nikūto* "nobody"; Gr. *οὐτις*, *μήτις* "nobody"; Toch. *tom<sup>1</sup> wārtant<sup>2</sup> mā<sup>3</sup> ke-kk<sup>4</sup> atsaṃ<sup>5</sup> (wār-pont<sup>6</sup>)* "these<sup>1</sup> forests<sup>3</sup> (enjoyed<sup>6</sup>) by no<sup>3</sup> one<sup>4</sup>" <sup>90)</sup>, and comparable phrases and constructions in Armenian, Anglo-Saxon and other languages <sup>91)</sup>.

In clauses containing two forms of these stems at least one of

<sup>87)</sup> For particulars: Hahn, p. 31 ff.; V. Lundström, in the *Eranos*, 1915, p. 203, etc.

<sup>88)</sup> For particulars regarding the distribution of these forms, the corresponding differentiation of case-forms, etc. see, apart from the grammars and handbooks of the individual languages, Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, I, p. 510 ff., and Brugmann, *Grundriss*<sup>3</sup>, II, 2, p. 350 ff.

<sup>89)</sup> Cf. e.g. also Debrunner-Wackernagel, o.c., III, p. 568 ff.

<sup>90)</sup> Sieg und Siegling, *Toch. Gramm.*, p. 188.

<sup>91)</sup> See e.g. Meillet, *Altarm. Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg 1913, p. 63; E. Sievers, *Angelsächsische Grammatik*<sup>3</sup>, Halle 1898, p. 184; compare also H. Pedersen, *Vergl. Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*, II, Göttingen, 1913, p. 212.

them is indefinite in character <sup>92</sup>): GAv. 50, 1 *kat<sup>1</sup> mōi<sup>2</sup> urvā<sup>3</sup> isē<sup>4</sup> čahyā<sup>5</sup> avarhō<sup>6</sup>* “quelle<sup>1</sup> aide<sup>6</sup> mon<sup>2</sup> âme<sup>3</sup> peut-elle attendre<sup>4</sup> de personne<sup>5</sup>?” (Duchesne-Guillemin); Gr. *τίς ποτε* “who in the world?, whoever?” <sup>93</sup>); Arist. Pl. 498 *τίς ἂν ἐξέυροι ποτ’ ἄμεινον*; *ποιός τις* makes a question less definite than *ποιός* “of what kind?” alone: Herodotus 3, 34 *κοῖόν μέ τινα νομίζουσι Πέρσαι εἶναι*; BhagG. 2, 21 *katham ... kaṃ ghātayati* probably means “how can he cause any one to slay?”; cf. also Boehtlingk, Ind. Spr.<sup>2</sup> II (1872), 3512 *nahi kasya priyaḥ ko vā ...*

Fixed and as a rule inseparable groups of two forms of these pronouns, like *quisquis* <sup>94</sup>), *κάς cid*, *ποιός τις*, are indefinite. So are those forms which stand in correlation with ‘indefinites’: *ποτέ μὲν ... ἄλλοτε*; *ὁ μὲν τις ... ἄλλος δέ*; and repeated correlative forms used in complementary-antithetical clauses: AInd. *kati ... kati* “some ... some”: *ποτέ μὲν ... ποτέ δέ* “at one time ... at another ...”; *τὸ μὲν τι ... τὸ δέ τι ...* <sup>95</sup>). Cf., in Hungarian, *ki a feleségével, ki a lányával* = Fr. *qui avec sa femme, qui avec sa fille* (: *ki*? “who?”; similarly, *hol*? “where”: *hol ... hol* indef.) <sup>96</sup>). Similarly, in phrases like *τι καί τι* “such and such things”, pop. Lat. *quid et quid* <sup>97</sup>).

In subordinate phrases we find: Lat. *si quis* etc., Umbr. *suepis*, Osc. *suae pis* “si quis”; Goth. *hva-* after *jabai* “if (ei)”, *ibai* “if (μή)”, *þatei* “that”; OChSl. *ašte kŭto ěito rečetu* “si quis quid dixerit” <sup>98</sup>), etc., and such cases as have already been commented upon in a previous part of this article.

Instances of an indefinite use of these stems under other circum-

<sup>92</sup>) Excepting the above-mentioned “mehrzielige Fragen”, in which two separate questions are asked in one clause by different forms of the pronominal stem(s). See also E. Kieckers, Hist. Griech. Gramm., (1926), III, p. 85.

<sup>93</sup>) For Sanskrit, see e.g. Monier Williams' Dict., s.v.

<sup>94</sup>) Cf. Av. Yt. 5, 101; Anc.Ind. *kānikāni cit*.

<sup>95</sup>) The well-known Sanskrit idiom *kva ... kva ... (viṣama)*, serving to denote great inconsistency or discrepancy between two entities or actions (e.g. Kāl. Megh. 5 *kva meghaḥ saṃdeśārthāḥ kva* “a cloud and the imports of messages are incompatible”), does not come under this head.

<sup>96</sup>) Cf. S. Simonyi, Die Ungarische Sprache, Strassburg 1907, p. 256; J. Brunot, La pensée et la langue, Paris 1936, p. 130.

<sup>97</sup>) I refer to E. Löfstedt, Philol. Komm. zur Peregr. Aetheriae (1911), p. 84.

<sup>98</sup>) See also Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. I, p. 510 ff.; Miklosich, o.c., IV, p. 86 f.; Sieg und Siegling, o.c., p. 189.

stances are however not wanting. Av. Y. 39, 2 (Yt. 13, 154) *urunō kudō.zātanəmčēt narəmčā nā'rinəmčā* "the souls of the men and women wherever they are born". Indian cases are very rare, and partly dubious <sup>99</sup>); the adj. *kiyadhāḥ* (RV. 1, 61, 6; 12), which was explained in Sāyaṇa's commentary by *kiyato 'navadhṛtaparimāṇasya balasya dhātā*, is often, and in all probability correctly, rendered by "was es auch sei schaffend" (Geldner) or other words to that effect. Beside *kati* "how many?" we have the derivative *katipaya-* "some"; Lat. *dixerit quis* etc.; Got. *hvo heilo* "for some time; *leitil hwa* "μικρόν τι"; Luke 7, 40 *skal þus hwa qipān* "ἔχω σοί τι εἰπεῖν" <sup>100</sup>); Lit. *mán taĩ kàs pasākė* "mir hat das jemand gesagt"; OChSl. *Marinŭ kto* "Marinus quidam", cf. also Russ. *čto nočĩ* "every night"; Dutch *wat* "something".

Greek, finally, is alone in using the simple indefinites freely in all types of sentences. This fact is closely connected with the absence, in this language, of combinations like *aliquis*, *kaš cid*, etc., which in my opinion are, generally speaking, secondary in origin. The strict accentual opposition *τις* : *τις* etc. may also have played a rôle. It is not probable that the entire wealth of semantic nuances which can be expressed by the Greek *τις* and its relatives reach back to a prehistoric period in which at least some branches of I.-E. were spoken in contiguous territories. Nor can we know for certain whether the use of the indefinites in cases other than those specified (negative sentences etc.) has remained stationary since Greek had become independent. Yet it seems warranted to surmise that the Greek usage gives us a reliable idea of prehistoric conditions prevailing over a wider idea <sup>101</sup>).

The regular difference in accent between *τις* etc. and *τις* etc. and the pronounced predilection of the former for standing at the beginning of a sentence — a position which, as we have seen, may be varied mainly for the sake of emphasis — and of the latter for occupying the second place, or for accompanying the word to which it belongs, are in perfect harmony with ancient rules <sup>102</sup>). It seems to be a reasonable assumption that the widespread use of the indefinite \**kʷ-* stems in

<sup>99</sup>) Cf. Debrunner-Wackernagel, o.c., III, p. 569.

<sup>100</sup>) See also O. Behaghel, in Paul und Braune's Beiträge 42 (1917), p. 158.

<sup>101</sup>) Cf. also Wackernagel, Kuhn's Zs. 29, p. 146.

<sup>102</sup>) I refer to Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., I, p. 388; E. Hermann, Probleme der Frage I, Nachr. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss., ph.-h. Kl. 1942, p. 244.



negative sentences, subordinate clauses, etc. belonged to the period of the parent speech and that in other cases, where the short pronominal forms were as a rule not supported by negative particles and conjunctions, or where they did not constitute parts of more or less fixed groups or constructions, in which — last but not least — the interrogative value was seldom or never required <sup>103</sup>), the longer forms had a chance not only to spread and to make part of the language, but even to oust simple *\*k<sup>u</sup>e/o-* *\*k<sup>u</sup>i-* at an early stage. It should however be remembered that longer forms — not infrequently the same longer forms — did not fail to make their appearance in connection with the *\*k<sup>u</sup>-*pronouns also in the other cases: Skt. *na kaś cana* "nobody": *kaś cana* "somebody"; *na ko 'pi*; *ko 'pi* <sup>104</sup>); *na kadācit* "never": *kadācit* "sometimes"; in Latin *aliquis* appears in negative sentences, after *si* etc. when it was emphasized, taking the place of *quidam*, *quisquam* etc. in the Romance languages; the form last mentioned was, in the classic period, used in negative sentence constructions. In these cases they likewise succeeded in supplanting the simple *\*k<sup>u</sup>-*forms: *nākiḥ* and *mākiḥ* belong to Vedic, not to the classic language. Nay, in the negative sentence the phrase with the *\*k<sup>u</sup>-*pronoun was often, at an early stage, ousted in its entirety and replaced by forms which, at least in the beginning, were more expressive: instead of the early *nequis*: *nemo* < *\*ne homo* and *nullus* < *\*ne oinelos* "not a sole person" in Latin; instead of the Homeric (and poetical) *οὔτις* : *οὔδεῖς* (< *οὔδὲ* + *εἷς* which as such is a stronger by-form in Attic); beside *ni* + *has* the more usual *ni ainshun* < *ains* "one" + *hun* which occurs after several indefinites <sup>105</sup>), and *ni manna* "no man"; cf. *niemand* in Dutch, *nobody* in English etc. <sup>106</sup>). It is not accidental that the Gr. *οὔτι μήτι* (and strengthened: *οὔτι γε*; *οὔτι μήν* etc.) remained, as an adverbial phrase, in frequent use, that, in Sanskrit, *cid* survived as a particle, and that to forms

<sup>103</sup>) It may be noticed that orthotone forms sometimes conveyed an indefinite sense: Debrunner-Wackernagel, o.c., III, p. 568 f.; Liddell and Scott, Gr.-Engl. Lex. (1948), II, p. 1797.

<sup>104</sup>) For particulars: Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, § 281 f. — In the Dravidian *kūi* the addition of the particle *vē* to the indef. pron. gives emphasis; it is always used in negative propositions.

<sup>105</sup>) See: Feist, o.c., p. 275.

<sup>106</sup>) Cf. my book "La place de la particule nég. *na* ...", Leyden 1951, p. 52 f.; 58 ff.

which had lost their negative sense, like the Ir. *nech* "aliquis, ullus, quisquam" <sup>107</sup>), the Lit. *nekàs* "something", the Russ. *někto* "aliquis" <sup>108</sup>) etc. a longer life was allotted.

The very substitution of indefinites of the *aliquid* or *quisquam* types by longer or reinforcing forms (Fr. *quelque chose*; Dutch *iemand* orig. "ever a man"; Eng. *any-*, *somebody* etc.) may on the other hand be made an argument in favour of the hypothesis that the forms which they had themselves replaced and from which they had been 'derived' were likewise indefinite in character.

So the conclusion might be — and it does not seem that we can, for the time being, penetrate the mystery of these words any further <sup>109</sup>) — that the I.E. *\*k<sup>u</sup>*-pronouns, like many comparable elements in other languages, expressed the idea of unspecified individuality; that — questions having much in common with statements both in form and function, intonation being the principal means of conveying the character of the enunciation <sup>110</sup>), and indefinite utterances as well as interrogations containing an unidentified term —, the difference in accent may have been, in the dim past, mainly a question of emphasis, comparable to such oppositions as *σέ : σε* etc. in Greek <sup>111</sup>). The *\*k<sup>u</sup>*-pronouns had, or 'obtained', their special functions only in the syntactic surroundings — including position in the sentence, sentence modulation etc. — in which they

<sup>107</sup>) See Pedersen, o.c., II, p. 213 f.

<sup>108</sup>) See Vondrák, o.c., II, p. 345.

<sup>109</sup>) See also Wackernagel, Vorl. über Syntax, II, p. 110 f.; Hermann, o.c., II, p. 385.

<sup>110</sup>) Cf. also the observations made by A. H. Gardiner, *The theory of speech and language*, Oxford 1932, p. 303 ff.; L. Bloomfield, *Language*, 1935, p. 114; 260; W. J. Entwistle, *Aspects of language*, London 1953, p. 175 f.; Hermann, o.c., I, p. 128.

<sup>111</sup>) See Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., I, p. 388. — Hindi *kyā*, Beng. *ki* etc. introduce and characterize interrogations which do not differ from affirmative sentences except for their intonation. We cannot always be sure whether in written documents an apparently affirmative enunciation was meant to express a question; in actual speech intonation would have left no doubt. In Sanskrit, some *mā* (= Gr. *μή*) clauses were questions. See also F. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit*, I, Yale Univ. 1953, p. 202. — The 'indef.' *kaccid* "occasionally" (Dutch "soms") is identical with the particle of interrogation *k*. (marking a question to which the speaker hopes for an affirmative answer); it can also be translated by "I hope that".

occurred <sup>112</sup>). That, in their interrogative function, they as a rule occupied the initial position is a consequence of the tendency to give that place to the word which bears the chief interrogatory force <sup>113</sup>). The limitation of interrogative elements to definite syntactic positions is a well-known phenomenon <sup>114</sup>). The indefinite forms, however, are rarely the first word in a sentence, and only seldom follow a pause. It may be observed that *τις* occasionally appears at the beginning, meaning "any one" in interrogations like Aesch. Ch. 654 *τις ἐνδον* "is any one within?"

## V

Before proceeding to discuss the relative use of the I.E. *\*k<sup>u</sup>*-pronouns it may be useful to enlarge upon some comparable elements in other languages. That the significance of words like the above indefinites does not differ much from that of terms for "man, human being" by which they are not infrequently replaced is too common to need illustration <sup>115</sup>). Yet it is worth mentioning that words for "human

---

<sup>112</sup>) Pronouns are specialized to general reference, and from the semantic point of view very vague. Their 'contents' consist of no more than elementary features of situations in which the utterances in which they occur are pronounced. See e.g. O. Jespersen, *Linguistica*, Copenhagen 1933, p. 329 ff.; L. Hjelmslev, in the *Mélanges-Van Ginneken*, Paris 1937, p. 51 ff. (with a bibliography); Z. Rysiewicz, in the *Rocznik Orient.* 17, Cracow 1953, p. 396 f. — Cf. also the various connotations expressed by e.g. the Eng. *ever* ("at any time" in neg., interr., or condit. sentences, etc.).

<sup>113</sup>) For Arabic *man* and *mā* see H. Reckendorf, *Arabische Syntax*, Heidelberg 1921, p. 32 and 290. — The IN. *apa* which gives a suggestion of indefiniteness or interrogation, is, e.g. in Bare'e, a postpositive, "more or less enclitic" (Adriani, *Bare'e Nederl. Wdb.*, Leyden 1928, p. 22) generalizing particle: "or so, or the like about, pretty nearly"; after a verbal form the Mal. *apa-lah* means "in some degree" > "would (you) mind" or "can (you) do anything to ..."; when used, in Javanese etc., as an interr. particle *apa* precedes the words for the facts, entities, circumstances etc. asked; the character of the sentence is indicated by the intonation.

<sup>114</sup>) See e.g. Bloomfield, o.c., p. 260; and, in general, Hermann, o.c., p. 218; 363 ff.; Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 627 f.

<sup>115</sup>) For their being used in the sense of "alius" — e.g. in Masai (Afr.): *lihae* "indef. pron.; (an)other; somebody else" — and the peculiarities of 'primitive' cultures which make these linguistic phenomena more intelligible

being" sometimes serve instead of our relative pronouns or conjunctions. In Bare'e (Cel.) *pai*<sup>1</sup> *da*<sup>2</sup> *nupokapuru*<sup>3</sup> *yaku*<sup>4</sup>, *tau*<sup>5</sup> *measi*<sup>26</sup> *ñkatuwu*<sup>7</sup> means: "please do<sup>1,2</sup> take pity on<sup>3</sup> me<sup>4</sup>, because I<sup>5</sup> lead<sup>7</sup> a miserable<sup>6</sup> existence<sup>7</sup>": here *tau* (which in another context must be translated by: "while (he, I etc.), etc.") obviously is the word for "individual", used as an opposition to *yaku* "I", the 'literal' translation being: "... on me, individual leading a ...". Whereas Bare'e has this idiom only in connection with living beings, other Celebes languages (Bada', Leboni etc.) avail themselves of the word for "human being" also in other cases: Bad. *pinatuwo*<sup>1</sup> *to*<sup>2</sup> *manara*<sup>3</sup> "animals<sup>1</sup> which<sup>2</sup> are domesticated<sup>3</sup>"; *upu*<sup>21</sup> *to*<sup>2</sup> *taita*<sup>3</sup> "all things<sup>1</sup> which<sup>2</sup> we see<sup>4</sup>". Similarly, the Jav. *won* "human being" and, in definite syntactic surroundings, "because, since" <sup>116</sup>). From these instances the relevance of the position of these words is, once again, evident.

In this connection it may not be out of place briefly to discuss a widespread Indonesian word in order to illustrate the character of at least part of the elements which are usually dealt with under one or more of the several divisions of the chapter 'pronouns'. The IN. element *nu* or *anu* <sup>117</sup>), which is often also considered to be a 'personal article', serves, for instance in Bare'e, not to determine a substantive, but to lay emphasis on it, to bring it to the fore: "what shall I give you?": *mau*<sup>1</sup> *ja*<sup>2</sup> *nu*<sup>3</sup> *loka*<sup>4</sup> "it might<sup>1</sup> even<sup>2</sup> be<sup>1</sup> bananas<sup>4</sup>". "How should we kill this animal?": "water (*nu uē*), therein it shall meet its death!" Often, however, the word is used as a sort of stopgap, for instance when the person speaking cannot immediately find the right word: "I should like to ask you for ... ěh, gambier (... *nu gambe*)". In cognate languages the force of this word is often similar: Sund. *nu lōtik* "the small people, the humble" as contrasted with "the

---

see my 'Reflections on the numerals "one" and "two"' ..., esp. p. 49 ff. — Words for "human being" are, e.g. in IN. languages, in frequent use for "another".

<sup>116</sup>) I refer to Adriani, *Spraakkunst Bare'e*, p. 358; C. Snouck Hurgronje, in the *Tijdschrift Ind. Taal-, Land- en Volk.* (Batavia), 37, p. 62 ( *Verspreide Geschriften*, V, Bonn-Leipsc 1925, p. 269 ff.) In Achehnese the word for "thing" (*atra*) can be used in a similar way.

<sup>117</sup>) The reader might be referred to an article by the present author: 'Indonesische relativa', *Bijdr. Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde* 102, p. 501 ff., esp. p. 518 f. See also *Lingua* III, p. 50 f.

rich, the man of rank". A longer form, *anu*, is described <sup>118)</sup> as a sort of article, used to bring out or to enhance the independent character of a word. We should, perhaps, rather say that it serves to isolate or to individualize. It corresponds to various idioms in our languages: "you should not marry a lázy<sup>2</sup>.<sup>3</sup> man<sup>1</sup>": ... *tuamá<sup>1</sup> anu<sup>2</sup> malose<sup>3</sup>*; "the tree<sup>1</sup> which<sup>2</sup> (grows) on<sup>3</sup> the bank<sup>4</sup> of the river<sup>5</sup>": *kaju<sup>1</sup> anu<sup>2</sup> ri<sup>3</sup> wiwi<sup>4</sup> ñkoronya<sup>5</sup>*. In these cases it can be omitted. Sometimes the force of *anu* is that of our "to wit": *nakoni<sup>1</sup> nu<sup>2</sup> asu<sup>3</sup>* "he has eaten it<sup>1</sup>, to wit<sup>2</sup> the dog<sup>3</sup>". In cases the following *anu* is obligatory: *anu<sup>1</sup> mabuya<sup>2</sup> sañkaju<sup>3</sup>* "white<sup>2</sup> (fabric) one piece<sup>3</sup>". If, in Mori, the word is placed before an adjective or a numeral it is, in our languages, translated by a definite article: *anu<sup>1</sup> motaha<sup>2</sup>* "NN<sup>1</sup> brown<sup>2</sup>" i.e. "the<sup>1</sup> brown<sup>2</sup> one<sup>1</sup>". It can also occur so as to "take together the contents of a relative clause" (Esser <sup>119)</sup>): that is to say, it can help to form an included clause. But, Dr. Esser readily admitted, *anu* is, in this function, more than a relative pronoun. Whereas in these constructions the word or words preceded by *anu* contain a qualification of the so-and-so or such-and-such referred to by this element, it is under other circumstances used as a substitute for a name or word which the speaker cannot hit upon or which is, for reasons of taboo or decency, to be avoided. In this function the element is widely distributed: Mal. *si-anu<sup>1</sup> di<sup>2</sup>-kampuñ<sup>3</sup> anu<sup>4</sup>* "so-and-so<sup>1</sup> at<sup>2</sup> such-and-such<sup>4</sup> a place<sup>3</sup>" (*si* is the 'personal article'). A similar sense is expressed in phrases like the Bare'e *anu<sup>1</sup> ndoño<sup>2</sup>ku<sup>3</sup>* "something<sup>1</sup> belonging to my<sup>3</sup> wife<sup>2</sup>" (the possessive relation being indicated by the juxtaposition of the nouns and by the form of the second noun). The construction *iku<sup>1</sup> nu<sup>2</sup> asu<sup>3</sup>* "tail<sup>1</sup> of a dog<sup>3</sup>" — which often is clearer, more emphatical, or also more long-winded than *iku asu* — may therefore be analyzed as follows: tail-in-general something-(belonging-to) a dog. This use led the author of the grammar, Dr. Adriani, to consider *nu* a 'genitive particle' <sup>120)</sup>, and another scholar, H. Kern <sup>121)</sup>, to suppose its original sense to have been that of "possession" <sup>122)</sup>.

<sup>118)</sup> Adriani, *Spraakkunst Bare'e-taal*, § 237.

<sup>119)</sup> Esser, *Klank- en vormleer van het Morisch*, § 207.

<sup>120)</sup> Adriani, o.c., § 265.

<sup>121)</sup> H. Kern, *Verspreide Geschriften*, IV, The Hague 1916 p. 270.

<sup>122)</sup> Sometimes *anu*, helping to form a clause the logical relation of which to the main clause is not explicitly expressed (see *Lingua* IV, p. 33 ff.), can be

Curiously enough the Tagalog *anò*, which must be the identical word, is an interrogative pronoun: "what, what kind of", required when asking the name etc. of a person or thing not known, and also in exclamations of the type: "what weakness!" <sup>123</sup>).

What now is the character of this word in Bare'e and cognate idioms? It would appear to me that it can fairly well be described as a particle referring to a person, object, or entity describing or characterizing them as comparatively independent unities, that it is a means of exhibiting their relative definiteness (which implies: their relative indefiniteness). Without stating in explicit terms or naming specifically it denotes an entity as a separate unity, as something special of its kind or among the other entities of its category. As such it often isolates, emphasizes, determines, individualizes, announces, includes, introduces, and specifies <sup>121</sup>). In any function it is the same word; it depends on the context and the construction of the sentence which equivalent must be used in translating. We should therefore be very cautious in distinguishing different "meanings" and in attempting to connect them genealogically.

Words of this type are, for our modern and Western 'linguistic feeling', vague and undefinable. In contradistinction to other words which may seem indispensable to us, such as definite and indefinite articles, a relative proper etc., they have a wide distribution in the languages of Indonesia and adjacent islands and countries.

## VI

In the theory advanced by Delbrück <sup>125</sup>) to explain the interrelations between the ancient I.E. interrogative, indefinite, and relative pronouns there is much that is still tenable and convincing. The so-called relative stem *jo-*, which is a well-known element in Indo-

translated by our "whereas, while" or "although": "(why do you hold me in contempt), although I have many relatives ...": *anu<sup>1</sup> maria<sup>2</sup> ja'i<sup>3</sup>ku<sup>4</sup>*, lit. "(being) somebody (who)' many<sup>2</sup> (are) my<sup>4</sup> relatives<sup>3</sup>".

<sup>123</sup>) I refer to L. Bloomfield, *Tagalog texts with grammatical analysis*, II, Urbana 1917, § 131.

<sup>124</sup>) The reader may for reasons of space be referred to the above publications; see also Adriani, *Bare'e-Nederlandsch Woordenboek*, Leyden 1928, p. 20.

<sup>125</sup>) Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, III, p. 389 ff.

Iranian, Greek, and Balto-Slavic, was in all probability also used in prehistoric Italian and other languages, but superseded by the stems *\*k<sup>u</sup>e-/k<sup>u</sup>o-*, *\*k<sup>u</sup>i-*, which even in historical times continued to develop a relative function. Various hypotheses were proposed to explain these processes in detail. The opinion pronounced by Wegener and modified by Deecke and other scholars, according to whom the interrogative — and interjectional — use was primary (e.g. Ter. Ph. 947 *argentum, quod habes, condonamus te < a. :: quod? (viz. a.) :: habes; condonamus te*) was rightly rejected by Brugmann, Delbrück, Hofmann and others <sup>126</sup>). A more convincing solution was proposed by Paetzolt <sup>127</sup>), who held the sentence type Fest. p. 166 *pecuniam quis nancitor, habeto* to have arisen from: "erlangt jemand Geld? dann soll er es haben" (cf. also Slav. sentences like the Russ. *kto odolějetŭ totŭ i pravŭ* "who is stronger, has right on his side") <sup>128</sup>). It must however be doubted, whether Hofmann was correct in considering this type of sentence to have always expressed a question. The original value of a construction of this form rather was: "erlangt jemand Geld — dann soll er es haben". The former clause must as a rule have been conditional or otherwise (virtually) subordinate; the pronoun was indefinite <sup>129</sup>). Yet this construction was neither considered the only, nor even the main, source of the relative use of the *\*k<sup>u</sup>-*pronouns. Since relative sentences containing these pronouns had, in historical times, sprung from interrogative constructions and since these pronouns had, in Greek, Slavonic and ancient German languages, acquired a relative function, the inference was commonly made that

<sup>126</sup>) See e.g. W. Deecke, *Die griech. und lat. Nebensätze ...*, Progr. Buchsweiler 1887; Brugmann, *Indog. Forsch.* 4, p. 229 ff.; W. Kroll, *Glotta* 3, p. 1 ff.; Hofmann, *Lat. Gramm.* <sup>5</sup>, p. 707.

<sup>127</sup>) Paetzolt, *Beiträge zur hist. Syntax der lat. spr.* IV, Progr. Waldenburg 1875.

<sup>128</sup>) Cf. especially Vondrák, o.c., II, p. 480 ff., (as to Lith. see F. Kurschat, *Gramm. d. litauischen Spr.*, Halle 1876, § 1562 f.).

<sup>129</sup>) Compare the views advanced by Delbrück, o.c., p. 390. Hofmann, o.c., p. 706 speaks of "parataktischen Fragesätzen mit indefinitem *quis*". — We may also refer to Greek sentences like Arist. Thesm. 405 *κάνει κόρη τις, εὐθὺς ἀδελφός λέγει ...*; Dem. 18, 274 *ἀδικεῖ τις ἐκὼν — ὀργήν ... κατὰ τοῦτον*; cf. in Latin, Ter. Eun. 252 *negat quis, nego*. See especially E. Kieckers, *Zur Parataxe im Sinne eines Kondizionalverhältnisses*, *Acta et commentationes Univ. Tartuensis*, B 33, 5, Dorpat 1936, p. 10 ff., and such Latin instances as are recorded by F. Neue, *Formenlehre d. lat. Spr.* (1875) II, p. 219.

the indirect or dependent interrogation had been the main factor contributing to the relative use of the 'interrogative pronoun' in pre-historic Latin and elsewhere <sup>130</sup>). The relevant processes were held to be an 'einzelsprachliche Neuerung' in Armenian, Albanian, Greek, Germanic, Italic, Balto-Slavic.

The discovery of Hittite forms deriving from the same stems, especially of *kuiš* which conveys an indefinite, an interrogative, and a relative sense, led the American scholars Sturtevant and Hahn to re-open the discussion <sup>131</sup>). It may be worth while to present the gist of their articles: The Hitt. *kuiš*, when relative, is, according to the former scholar, usually postpositive (the 'antecedent' forming part of the 'relative' clause), often doubled, frequently resumed by a demonstrative element; the relative clause tends to stand before the main clause. These characteristics are also frequent in early Latin and in the Oscan and Umbrian documents: Plaut. Trin. 137 *ille qui mandavit, eum exturbasti ex aedibus*. It may therefore be warranted to conclude that the 'relative' or 'connective' value of this stem was also Indo-European <sup>132</sup>). The subsequent investigations of Miss Hahn brought to light that a Hitt. subordinate relative clause can scarcely be distinguished from a coordinate indefinite clause: *Ū-NU-TE-MEŠ-ya-lán ku-e an-da-an na-at sa-ra-a da-a-i* "and the utensils which (are) therein, these he picks up" can also be translated: "and some utensils (are) therein; and these he picks up". A variety of features characterizing the indefinite type are found to be present in a large majority of examples of the relative type.

---

<sup>130</sup>) See — to mention only these scholars — (Brugmann, *Grundriss*<sup>2</sup>, II, 2, p. 348); Delbrück, *o.c.*, p. 391; F. Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, Heidelberg 1914, p. 405; Leumann, *Lat. Gramm.*, p. 288; Hofmann, *ibid.*, p. 706; Ernout-Meillet, *Dict. étym.*<sup>3</sup>, p. 988 f.

<sup>131</sup>) E. H. Sturtevant, *Relatives in Indo-European and Hittite*, Language Monographs VII, Baltimore 1930, p. 141 ff.; E. A. Hahn, *The origin of the relative kai- kao-*, *Language* 22 (1946), p. 68 ff.

<sup>132</sup>) I cannot follow Sturtevant in his Indo-Hittite theory. — In non-I E. languages the "want of relative pronouns is compensated", *inter alia*, by using indef. or interr. pronouns in correlation with demonstratives, or by "splitting up" propositions into indef. or interr. clauses and their sequels. — One might also compare H. Reckendorf, *Die syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen*, Leyden 1896, p. 604 ff.; J. R. Swanton, *Haida*, in: *Handbook of American Indian Languages* I, Washington 1911, p. 261, etc.



I would ask myself whether scholars have not gone too far in clinging to the traditional distinction between the various pronominal categories which, though rightly discerned in classical Latin and other languages, are by no means distinct co-existent categories in any language. It would appear to me that we are not infrequently too much inclined to interpret pre- and protohistoric facts in the light of classic and traditional schemes and terminology. Even in classic Latin the pronouns under discussion are, as far as their outward forms are concerned, kept apart only in the nom. sing. and in the acc. sing. neuter. Miss Hahn is no doubt right in laying stress on syntactic factors, such as the position of the pronouns in the sentence and their relations to other words. But other factors of relevance (e.g. modulation, pauses in pronouncing the sentence) remain unknown to us. We should therefore be cautious in drawing conclusions with regard to the I.E. period and guard against the unwarrantable assumption that the then constructions exactly agreed with one of our modern sentence types, or, rather, with one of the sentence types of traditional grammar.

The 'indefinite' — or, as Miss Hahn prefers to call it, non-restrictive — character of the Hitt. 'relative' clause agrees with the fact that in Oscan-Umbrian, where the forms of *\*k<sup>u</sup>o-* are used in rel. clauses with a 'definite' antecedent, those of *\*k<sup>u</sup>i-* help to form 'indefinite' rel. clauses. In Latin, too, *quis* appears in the latter case<sup>133</sup>): cf. L. XII Tab. 1, 4 *proletario iam civi quis volet vindex esto*. Without going so far as to contend that all Latin relatives come from indefinites we may suppose the rel. *quis* etc. to represent a specialized use of the 'indefinite'. The type of sentence Plaut. Amph. 1009 may reflect an original: "I wanted to meet a certain N.; he was not on board ship" (*Naucratem quem convenire volui, in navi non erat*): cf. the Greek  $\rho$  501  $\xi\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$   $\tau\iota\varsigma$   $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\eta\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota$  ... "some wretched stranger roams ...": E 9  $\eta\nu$   $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$   $\tau\iota\varsigma$  ...  $\Delta\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\varsigma$  "there was ... one (un nommé) D."

In the oldest Greek texts the 'general relative'  $\iota$   $\delta\acute{o}\tau\iota\varsigma$ <sup>134</sup>), i.e.

<sup>133</sup>) For particulars see: R. von Planta, *Grammatik d. osk.-umbr. Dialekte*, II, Strassburg 1897, p. 424 f.; Fr. Neue-C. Wagener, *Formenlehre d. lat. Spr.*<sup>3</sup>, II, Leipzig 1905, p. 430; Hoffman, *Gramm.*, p. 706; Meillet-Vendryes, *Gramm. comparée*<sup>2</sup>, p. 637; W. M. Lindsay, *The Latin language*, p. 444 ff.; A. Ernout, *Hist. Formenlehre des Lat.*<sup>3</sup>, § 140 ff.

<sup>134</sup>) I refer to Schwyzler-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 643.

the identical enclitic \**k<sup>u</sup>i-* preceded by \**io-*<sup>135</sup>). Here the order of the elements *ὅς* and *τις* is not only a matter of form, *τις* being enclitic, but it represents a special case of a phenomenon of wide occurrence, the so-called insertion of the antecedent in the relative phrase. This construction was, in short, chosen if the antecedent (or part of it) was essentially, not accidentally, determined by the contents of the 'relative' clause. Thus the subject of *κ* 38 f. is not beloved to all men, or to men in general, but to those men of unspecified individuality (*τις*) who are the inhabitants of the towns to which the subject comes: *ὥς ὁδε πᾶσι φίλος ... ἔστιν | ἀνθρώποις, ὁτεῶν τε πόλιν καὶ γαῖαν ἱκῆται*. Similarly, *ο* 35 *πέμψει δὲ τοι οὖρον ὀπισθεν | ἀθανάτων ὅς τις σε φυλάσσει* means "that particular (but unspecified) deity who is your protector will send a fair breeze in your wake", not "one of the deities who is casually or accidentally interested in your well-being ..."; cf. *Ο* 290 ... *τις ... θεῶν* "some one of the gods", and especially *τ* 40 *ἦ μάλα τις θεὸς ἔνδον, οἱ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσι* "surely some god is within, one of those who hold broad heaven", where the relative clause could have been omitted. The words *α* 47 *ὥς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος, ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι* likewise refer to any other person characterized by doing such deeds, not to any other whomsoever, who as a matter of little importance, does them. Cf. e.g. also: *B* 687; *Ψ* 285; 494; *β* 113; 124; *γ* 16; *θ* 573 (*ὅς τινος ἵκεο χώρας*); *ο* 359; *ρ* 317. In cases like *B* 687 *τις* after *ὅς* is the whole 'antecedent': *Ψ* 667 *ἄσσον ἴτω ὅς τις δέπας οἴσεται* "let him draw near who is to bear the cup". Hence also the phrase *οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις*, e.g. *Arist. Ran.* 1217 *οὐκ ἔστιν ὅς τις πάντ' ἀνὴρ εὐδαιμονεῖ* and such passages as *Soph. Tr.* 6 *ἐγὼ δὲ τὸν ἐμὸν (αἰῶνα) ... | ἔξοιδ' ἔχουσα δυστυχῇ ... | ἦτις ... νυμφείων ὄκνον | ἄλγιστον ἔσχον*, which may be supposed to reflect an original: "I for one know that my life is unlucky, (I) a person (*τις*) characterized by the fact that I suffered most painful fear arising from marriage".

However striking the difference between the Greek construction with, and its Latin counterpart without, \**io-* might be, the relative clause of the type represented by *Plaut. Amph.* 1009 came to fulfil the same function: like *ὅστις*, which already in *Herodotus* and *Sophocles* was used to convey an individual force, i.e. instead of *ὅς* —

<sup>135</sup>) For which see my paper in the *Lingua*, IV, p. 1 ff., and for the construction to be discussed esp. p. 22.

Hdt. 1, 7 ἀπόγονοι Αὐδοῦ ..., ἀτ' ὄρεο ὁ δῆμος Αὐδῖος ἐκλήθη ... — <sup>136</sup>), the Lat. *quis* very soon assumed a definite (restrictive) value also. The Hittite facts <sup>137</sup>) seem to allow us to assume a similar development.

An important point in the prehistory of the relative construction in Latin and other languages has remained unexplained: the way in which \**jo-* (Gr. *ὅς*), Skt. *ya-* etc.) was replaced by the \**k<sup>u</sup>-*stems <sup>138</sup>), and the factors contributing to its early disappearance, or (more cautiously speaking) its absence in so many I.E. languages. In endeavouring to solve this problem the 'lautschwaches' character of the stem \**jo-* and, as far as Latin is concerned, the early disappearance of the correlative stem \**so-* etc. may perhaps be a help. But the main determining cause in this process seems to have been constituted by the very nature of the clauses introduced by these pronouns.

Of all branches of Indo-European the Indian is practically alone in having preserved the \**jo-*pronoun to the present day <sup>139</sup>). This remarka-

<sup>136</sup>) I refer to Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 643; E. Hermann, Die Nebensätze in den griechischen Dialektinschriften, Leipzig-Berlin 1912, p. 233. I cannot agree with Schwyzer-Debrunner in interpreting *ὅς τις Ψ 43* by: "der seiner Art nach, seinem Wesen nach"; the words (*οὐ μὰ*) *Ζῆν, ὅς τις τε θεῶν ὑπατος* when given their 'original sense' may have meant: "Zeus the-one-who (*ὅς*) on his part (or: in contradistinction to others: *τε*) is the unspecified individual essentially characterized by being the highest of gods".

<sup>137</sup>) See Hahn, o.c., p. 81.

<sup>138</sup>) The conviction that it has indeed belonged to 'prehistoric Latin' etc. was e.g. pronounced by Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. III, p. 404; Hahn, Am. Ph. Ass. 64, 37; Hirt, Indog. Gramm. VII, p. 133. The correspondence between Gr. *ὅ* "that, because" (and Skt. *yad*, Av. *yāt*) and the Lat. *quod*, Goth. *patei* "that" was with good reason made an argument by Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 645, n. 4. Cf. also, despite the difference in meaning (see Wackernagel, Indog. Forsch. 31, p. 267 f.; Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., I, p. 616, n. 8), the Lat. *quia* "why (e.g. Verg. Aen. 5, 13); because" (see e.g. Ernout-Meillet, Dict. etym.<sup>3</sup>, p. 982); cf. Gr. Boeot. *τέ* "why" etc.) on the one hand, and the sporadic Gr. *ᾧ* in the sense of *ὅ* on the other.

<sup>139</sup>) In Sogdian the stem *ya-* has disappeared; its function was taken over by *ka-/ka-*, the ancient interr.-indef. (see E. Benveniste, Essai de grammaire sogdienne, II, Paris 1929, p. 131). Cf. also the as a rule indef. neuter relative (*\*)čw < \*cam* which had replaced the ancient *čit*. For Persian see H. Jensen, Neupersische Grammatik, Heidelberg 1931, p. 91 ff. Already in the classic period the Gr. representative of \**k<sup>u</sup>i-* could fulfil the function of *ὅστις* when it was a generalizing relative, and, moreover, that of *ὅς* (I refer to Hermann, o.c., p. 227; Kühner-Gerth, Ausf. Gramm. d. griech. Spr., Satzlehre,

ble fact would appear to me to be closely connected with the character of the Indian relative clause. Whereas in many other languages the relative clause may be a concurrent idiom of participles and adjectives and a means of paraphrasing, Sanskrit only uses it to express such attributes as are of importance to the understanding of the main clause: cf. e.g. Bhagavadgītā 10, 3 *yo<sup>1</sup> mām<sup>2</sup> ajam<sup>3</sup> anādim<sup>4</sup> ca<sup>5</sup> vetti<sup>6</sup> ... | ... sa<sup>7</sup> ... sarva<sup>8</sup>pāpaiḥ<sup>8</sup> pramucyate<sup>9</sup> "who<sup>1</sup> knows<sup>6</sup> Me<sup>2</sup>, the unborn<sup>3</sup> and<sup>5</sup> beginningless<sup>4</sup> ... he<sup>7</sup> is freed<sup>9</sup> from all evils<sup>8</sup>"; 16 *divyā<sup>1</sup> hy<sup>2</sup> ātmavibhūṭayaḥ<sup>3</sup> | yābhir<sup>4</sup> ... lokān<sup>5</sup> imāms<sup>6</sup> tvam<sup>7</sup> vyāpya<sup>8</sup> tiṣṭhasi<sup>9</sup> "(Thy) divine<sup>1</sup> manifestations<sup>3</sup>, by which<sup>4</sup> pervading<sup>8</sup> these<sup>6</sup> worlds<sup>5</sup> Thou<sup>7</sup> abidest (in them)<sup>9</sup>"<sup>140</sup>). In any given Sanskrit text many instances can be noticed of participles or absolutes which in an English or Dutch translation must be rendered by a subordinate clause: BhG. 1, 9; 10; 39 etc. etc. That means that the original function of (\**io-* >) *ya-* — focussing the attention of the hearer on a word or word group of special interest<sup>141</sup>) — is still recognizable.**

On the other hand, the indirect construction, including the indirect interrogation, although not wholly unknown in Sanskrit, is not idiomatic. The direct construction (*paṇṇaccha<sup>1</sup>: kas<sup>2</sup> tvam<sup>3</sup> (iti<sup>4</sup>)* "4he asked<sup>1</sup>: 4 who<sup>2</sup> (are) you<sup>3</sup>?"), often characterized by *iti* is in all periods of Indo-Aryan largely preferred<sup>142</sup>). It must even be noticed that the general impression we may obtain from the descriptions in grammars is not completely correct. The object of the words of saying, thinking, believing, etc. is often expressed by a clause introduced by *yat* (*yathā, yataḥ*)<sup>143</sup>): Kathāsar. 3, 57 *cintā<sup>1</sup> me<sup>2</sup> putra<sup>3</sup> yad<sup>4</sup> bhāryā<sup>5</sup> nā<sup>6</sup>nurūpā<sup>7</sup> tava<sup>8</sup> kvacit<sup>9</sup> "I am<sup>2</sup> grieved<sup>1</sup>, my son<sup>3</sup>, that<sup>4</sup> you<sup>8</sup> have*

II, p. 517; Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 644 (with a bibliography). Modern Greek rel. clauses are introduced by *ποῦ* or *ὅ ὁποῖος*. (For Celtic see Pedersen, Vergl. Gramm. II, p. 235 f.).

<sup>140</sup>) See also Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, § 455; Ved. u. Sanskrit-Syntax, § 271: "Das ind. Relativpronomen hat ... den Zweck ... durch Hervorhebung einer kennzeichnenden ... Tatsache den betreffenden Bezugsbegriff von der gewünschten Seite zu beleuchten "

<sup>141</sup>) See Lingua, IV, p. 1 ff.

<sup>142</sup>) For particulars see: J. Bloch, L'indo-aryen, Paris 1934, p. 313 ff.; Renou, Gramm. sanscr., p. 512; Speyer, Ved. u. S. Syntax, § 288; Dh. Varma, La langue braj, Paris 1935, p. 129; E. Greaves, Hindi grammar, Allahabad 1933, p. 152 ff.; T. Grahame Bailey, Panjabi, Calcutta 1912, p. 113.

<sup>143</sup>) For Avestan see L. H. Gray, Contributions to Avestan Syntax, J. Am. Or. Soc. 22, 1, p. 168 ff.

not<sup>4</sup> a wife<sup>5</sup> meet<sup>7</sup> for you<sup>8</sup>". In these cases *iti* may even be retained<sup>144</sup>). As we have seen in a previous article<sup>145</sup>), the conjunction *yat* is in the first place a means of paraphrasing, especially when the following word or words are an important element of the sentence. The word or clause introduced by the conjunction are, in character, a direct quotation. The same construction is used after words of examining, knowing, in expressing a subordinate interrogation, etc.: B.ār.Up. 6, 2, 2 *vettha<sup>1</sup> yathe<sup>2</sup>māh<sup>3</sup> prajāh<sup>4</sup> prayatyo<sup>5</sup> vipratipadyante<sup>6</sup>* "do you know<sup>1</sup> how<sup>2</sup> people<sup>4</sup> here<sup>3</sup> on departing<sup>5</sup> separate in different directions<sup>6</sup>?" Although the sentence is interrogative the conjunction in itself does not bear that force. Besides, verbs of knowing etc. are often followed by inflected forms of *ya-*: e.g. RV. 8, 92, 18 *vidmā hi yās te ... tvāddattaḥ* "for we know which is the ... given by Thee". Similar observations may be made with regard to the 'relative-interrogative' ὥς — B 3 *μερμήριζε ... ὥς Ἀχιλῆα | τιμήσῃ* "he was pondering how he might do honour to A."; Soph. O.C. 75 *οἷσθ, ὦ ξέν', ὥς νῦν μὴ σφαλῆς*; "do you know, O stranger, how you will not go wrong?" — and to the use of *ὅς* etc. in 'indirect clauses': Arist. Ach. 118 *ἐγὼ οἶδ' ὅς ἐστι*<sup>146</sup>). In a minority of cases, which do not seem to reach back to the earliest period — in Avestan *ya-* and its derivatives are usual —, Sanskrit has, in these clauses, an interrogative pronoun: Budhasvāmin, BKŚl. 24, 28 *ākhyāta<sup>1</sup> nipuṇam<sup>2</sup> dṛṣtvā<sup>3</sup> kataro<sup>4</sup> rūpavān<sup>5</sup> iti<sup>6</sup>* "have a good look (at them)<sup>2, 3</sup> (and) tell<sup>1</sup> who<sup>4</sup> is the better-looking". Certain instances of *ka-* instead of *ya-* under other circumstances are practically wanting: BhagG. 1, 22 *ratham<sup>1</sup> sthāpaya<sup>2</sup> me<sup>3</sup> ... || yāvad<sup>4</sup> etān<sup>5</sup> nirīkṣe<sup>6</sup> 'ham<sup>7</sup> ... | kair<sup>8</sup> mayā<sup>9</sup> saha<sup>10</sup> yoddhavyam<sup>11</sup>* may, it is true, be translated: "halt<sup>2</sup> my<sup>3</sup> chariot<sup>1</sup> ... so that<sup>4</sup> I<sup>7</sup> may observe<sup>6</sup> these<sup>5</sup> ..., with<sup>10</sup> whom<sup>8</sup>, I<sup>9</sup> must fight<sup>11</sup>", but the correct interpretation appears to be: "... I may espy these ... (and see): with whom ...? (> with whom ...)"<sup>147</sup>).

<sup>144</sup>) I refer to Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, § 494

<sup>145</sup>) Lingua, IV, esp. p. 15 ff.

<sup>146</sup>) See Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 630; 643. A number of instances were collected by J. van Leeuwen, Arist. Acharnenses, Leyden: 1901, p. 29. — For the terminology used in connection with these clauses — 'subordinate interrogative clause' ('indirekter Fragesatz') is inaccurate — see Delbrück, o.c., III, p. 300 ff.; 431 f.; Altind. Syntax, p. 569.

<sup>147</sup>) See F. Edgerton, The Bhagavad gītā, I, Harvard 1944, p. 7 and Nīlakaṇṭha's commentary.

It may, in the third place, be remembered that in Sanskrit the whole inflection of the interr. pronoun had come to be formed from *ka-*, excepting the anomalous n. acc. sg. n. *kim* (other representatives of *\*k<sup>u</sup>i-* are the stereotyped *nákis, cid*)<sup>148</sup>; that, apart from the cases mentioned above, the simple indefinite pronoun does not normally occur; that the generalizing or indefinite relative ("quisquis, quicumque") has from the beginning a special form: *ya-ka-ca, ya-ka-cit, ya-ya-, ya-sa-*<sup>149</sup>).

So the conclusion must be that in Anc.Indian, and in the main also in Indo-Iranian, the *ya*-clauses, the interrogative and the indefinite sentences were both in the form of their pronouns and in their particular character, kept clearly apart. If we may, on the strength of inferences to be drawn mainly from Greek and Slavonic, consider these features of I.Ir. syntax to reflect, in the main, ancient usage, it does not seem to be hard to form a fairly true picture of prehistoric conditions: generally speaking, and not taking other constructions into account, the *\*iō*-clauses were used to distinguish, isolate or emphasize part of the utterance<sup>150</sup>), the *\*k<sup>u</sup>-*constructions, if not 'indefinite', expressed direct interrogations. In those provinces of Indo-European where *\*iō-* was already in prehistoric times replaced by *\*k<sup>u</sup>-* the following developments, part of which can be paralleled and, hypothetically, elucidated by historical evolutions in other languages, may have taken place. The gradual loss of emphasis of the *\*iō*-construction, the change in its original character, by which it came to develop into a relative clause in the traditional sense of the term — cf. e.g. instances like Xen. Anab. 1, 2, 7 *παράδεισος μέγας ἀγρῶν θηρῶν πλήρης, ὃ ἐκεῖνος ἐθήρευν ἀπὸ ἵππου* -- on the one hand, and an increasing tendency to subordinate interrogations and to give them an indirect character on the other, may have contributed to lessen the original difference between these constructions. After many verbs — those of asking, knowing, thinking, believing, wondering, informing, mentioning etc. — both pronouns and their derivatives came into

<sup>148</sup>) For particulars concerning these innovations: Debrunner-Wackernagel, o.c., III, p. 560 ff.

<sup>149</sup>) For particulars: Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, § 287. For Avestan: H. Reichelt, Avestisches Elementarbuch, Heidelberg 1909, § 741; Caland, Syntax d. Pron. (see above), p. 48 f.

<sup>150</sup>) For a more detailed description see Lingua IV, esp. p. 18.

use in otherwise similar sentence constructions. In ancient Greek and Slavonic they have entered into competition — we for instance find: γ 185 οὐδέ τι οἶδα | κείνων, οἳ τ' ἐσώθην Ἀχαιῶν ... "I do not know anything of those, who of the A. were saved ..."; Soph. O.C. 1171 ἐξοιδ' ... ὅς ἐσθ' ὁ προστάτης "I know well who is the suppliant"; οἶσθ' δ, οἶσθ' ὥς in tragic and comic writers beside ρ 373 οἶ σάρα οἶδα, πόθεν ... "I know not surely from whence ..."; Xen. Anab. 2, 5, 7 οὐκ οἶδα, οὐτ' ἀπὸ ποίου ἂν τάχους; γιγνώσκω + ὅς ρ 363; cf. II 120; + πότερος E 85 <sup>151</sup>); α 170 κατάλεξον | τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; <sup>152</sup>) It is however interesting to observe that after verba interrogandi Greek — in contradistinction to Indo-Iranian: RV. 1, 164, 34 *prchāmi*<sup>1</sup> *yātra*<sup>2</sup> *bhūvanasya*<sup>3</sup> *nābhiḥ*<sup>4</sup> "I ask<sup>1</sup> where<sup>2</sup> (is) the navel<sup>4</sup> of the world<sup>3</sup>?" <sup>153</sup>) — does not use forms of the \*iō-pronoun: ο 423 εἰρώτα δὴ ἔπειτα τίς εἶη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι "then he asked (her) who she was, and whence she came". In exclamations both pronouns could in all probability have been used already in prehistoric times: Φ 441 *νηπίτι*, ὥς ἄνοον κραδίην ἔχεις "fool, how witless is the heart you have!" and A 552 *Κρονίδη, ποῖον τὸν μῦθον ἔειπες* "son of Cronos, what a word hast thou said!" — in Mod.Gr. only the interrogative turn has been left <sup>154</sup>) —; similarly, in Slavonic, and in Sanskrit, where, however, the *ka*-construction, though rather rare, seems to have been preferred: Pāṇ. 8, 1, 37 f., comm. *yathā*<sup>1</sup> *pacati*<sup>2</sup> *śobhanam*<sup>3</sup> "how<sup>1</sup> excellent<sup>3</sup> (is) his cooking<sup>2</sup>!" (expressing admiration) and Bh.nār. Venis. 1, 17 + *kā*<sup>1</sup> *khalu*<sup>2</sup> *velā*<sup>3</sup> *trabhavatyāḥ*<sup>4</sup> *prāptāyāḥ*<sup>5</sup> "how<sup>1</sup> long<sup>3</sup> it<sup>1</sup> (is), indeed<sup>2</sup>, since<sup>3</sup> her ladyship<sup>4</sup> was here<sup>5</sup>!" — Besides, cases were no doubt not rare in which one meaning of the 'governing term' usually required the \*iō-pronoun, another a *k*<sup>u</sup>-pronoun (cf., in Greek,

<sup>151</sup>) It may be noticed that a Greek equivalent of the I.Ir. *yatara*- "who (which) of two (rel.)" which would be used in a case like this does — apart from the Gort. *στερος* (3<sup>rd</sup> cent. B.C.) which may reach back to the prehistoric period (bibliography: Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., I, p. 615) — practically not exist in Greek; *k<sup>u</sup>otere/o-* had an early and wide occurrence: AInd. *katara-*, Osc. *pūtereī-(pīd)*, Got. *hwapar* etc. (see Walde-Pokorny, Vgl. Wtb. I, p. 521)

<sup>152</sup>) There are slight differences in meaning, for which see Kühner-Gerth, o.c., II, 2, p. 438 f.

<sup>153</sup>) For Avestan, see Reichelt, o.c., p. 789.

<sup>154</sup>) More instances: Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 626; for Mod.Gr.: A. Thumb, Handbuch der neugriech. Volkssprache<sup>2</sup>, Strassburg 1910, p. 171 f.

Soph. Tr. 589 ὄρα τί ποιεῖς "pay heed to what you do": ὀράω ~ OHG. *giwar* 'attentive, careful'), in which an interrogative implication was optional, or in which a shift of meaning of the governing verb entailed a non-interrogative value of the following *\*k<sup>u</sup>*-construction. — Where, moreover, the subordinate clauses came to be marked by characteristics of their own (especially by the use of a special mood of the verb)<sup>155</sup>), another factor arose which could contribute to a further assimilation of both sentence types. — It should, finally, be remembered that the popular predilection for interrogative constructions<sup>156</sup>) instead of various other choices and arrangements of words, as well as the above-mentioned use of the 'indefinite' *\*k<sup>u</sup>*-pronouns in a 'relative' function must have exerted considerable influence upon the spread of the *\*k<sup>u</sup>*- constructions over new domains; and also that the necessity to use part of the case forms of the thematic stem in order to supplement the defective paradigm of *k<sup>u</sup>i-* was always apt to further the spread of a particular function acquired by one of these stems to the other. That the cases of an originally indefinite *\*k<sup>u</sup>*-pronoun of the type Plaut. Amph. 1009 *Naucratem quem convenire volui, in navi non erat* came to be relative constructions can, I would venture to suppose, be attributed to the relative force acquired by the *\*k<sup>u</sup>*-pronouns in the above sentences.

Such are the factors which may have led to a state of affairs such as exists in OChSlav., where in indirect interrogations "le choix est fréquemment libre entre la proposition interrogative indirecte et la proposition relative"<sup>157</sup>), the former being more 'idiomatic' and tending to predominate. Particular circumstances such as the use of ὅστις in Greek having already found ample comment in the works of my predecessors<sup>158</sup>), I omit any further discussion of this point.

<sup>155</sup>) For a brief survey of the relevant points: Brugmann, *Grundriss*<sup>4</sup>, II, 3, p. 874 ff.; Meillet-Vendryes, *Gra nm. comparée*, §§ 933 ff.; see also: Delbrück, o.c., III, p. 439 ff.; Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 630; 642; Hofmann, *Lat. Gramm.*<sup>5</sup>, p. 700 f.

<sup>156</sup>) Cf. e.g. Soph. El. 316 ὥς νῦν ἀπόντος ἰσχύει, τί σοι φίλον (or ἰσχύει τί σοι φίλον?). For τίς = ὅς: Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 644.

<sup>157</sup>) A. Vaillant, *Manuel du vieux slave I*, Paris 1948, p. 342. I also refer to Miklosich, *Vergl. Gramm.*, IV, p. 77; 86; 91; Vondrák, o.c., II, p. 451 ff.; 480 ff.; 488 ff.; 528 ff.

<sup>158</sup>) See e.g. Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 644; Meillet-Vendryes, o.c., p. 637.



## VII

Some remarks on the Indo-Iranian *cid* may also find a place here. According to Delbrück and other scholars <sup>159)</sup> AInd. *cid* is a 'hervorhebende Partikel', which, inter alia in connection with interrogative pronouns, also bears a generalizing force. Debrunner-Wackernagel, though correctly deriving it from \**k<sup>u</sup>i-*, likewise hold its primary sense to have been "sogar, jedenfalls" <sup>160)</sup>. The identical Osc. *pid* was called an indefinite particle by Von Planta, Walde-Hofmann, and Buck, who says: "... it stands in the same relation to Lat. *-que* as Skt. *-cid* to *-ca*, both of these being used as generalizing particles though in different combinations" <sup>161)</sup>. As no other attempt to reconstruct the semantic development of this word seems to have been made, I would suggest considering passages like the following to give an idea of its original use: 1°. AV. 5, 11, 6 *enā<sup>1</sup> parāḥ<sup>2</sup> ... durṇāśam<sup>3</sup> cid<sup>4</sup> arvāk<sup>5</sup>*, where nothing but the common opinion that *cid* is a 'particle' would prevent us from regarding it as a regular neuter = Gr. *τι*: Whitney-Lanman accordingly translate: "beyond that<sup>1 2</sup> (is) something<sup>4</sup> hard to get at<sup>3</sup> from this side<sup>5</sup>"; similarly, RV. 1, 24, 9 (cf. AV. 6, 97, 2; 7, 42, 1) *kṛtām<sup>1</sup> cid<sup>2</sup> énaḥ<sup>3</sup> prā<sup>4</sup> mumugdhy<sup>5</sup> asmāt<sup>6</sup>*, where the translation given by the same scholars ("put away<sup>4 5</sup> from us<sup>6</sup> any<sup>2</sup> committed<sup>1</sup> sin<sup>3</sup>") must, to my mind, be decidedly preferred to Geldner's "auch die getane Sünde nimm von uns"! (cf., in Greek, e.g. Soph. Ant. 252 ἀσῆμος οὐρογάτης τις ἦν "the offender, whoever he may be, was unnoticed"); RV. 1, 49, 3; 124, 12; the phrase *dūré cit* (AV. 4, 28, 2; cf. 3, 3, 2) may with Whitney-Lanman be rendered by: "whatever is afar"; AV. 4, 21, 6 (= RV. 6, 28, 6) *medayatkā kṛśām cit* may mean "fatten whatever is lean" <sup>162)</sup>; passages like RV. 3, 32, 16 *yád<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>159)</sup> Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 478. Cf. also Petrograd Dict. I. 1025 i.; Bartholomae, Altiran. Wtb., 588 ff.; Speyer, Ved. u. Sanskrit-Syntax, p. 69; Grassmann, Wörterbuch zum Rig-veda, 454 f.

<sup>160)</sup> Debrunner-Wackernagel, o.c., III, p. 559; see also Renou, Gramm. de la langue védique, p. 376; Pokorny, Indogerm. etym. Wtb., p. 646.

<sup>161)</sup> Von Planta, Gramm. d. osk.-umbr. Dial. II, p. 161 f.; Walde-Hofmann, o.c., II, p. 410; Buck, Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian, p. 147. — Compare also the A.Inc. particle *id* (see e.g. Grassmann, Wörterbuch zum Rig-veda, 205 f.)

<sup>162)</sup> The neuter implying, or vaguely denoting, living beings, as *τι* in Hom. h. Aphr. 34.

... *dṛḍhām*<sup>2</sup> *cid*<sup>3</sup> *drujo*<sup>4</sup> *gávyam*<sup>5</sup> *ūrvām*<sup>6</sup> may, at least originally, have meant: "when<sup>1</sup> Thou brokest open<sup>4</sup> the byre<sup>5,6</sup>, however<sup>3</sup> solid<sup>2</sup> it was" (i.e. "solid in any degree"<sup>163</sup>); in this case and 4, 3, 14 *jahí*<sup>1</sup> *rákṣo*<sup>2</sup> *máhi*<sup>3</sup> *cid*<sup>4</sup> *vāvṛdhānām*<sup>5</sup> "kill<sup>1</sup> the demon<sup>2</sup> however<sup>4</sup> vastly<sup>3</sup> he has increased<sup>5</sup>" > "... auch wenn er mächtig erstarkt ist" (Geldner) the well-known 'concessive' value of the word may have detached itself from the context in which it was implied; AV. 7, 16, 1; 2°. RV. 1, 30, 4 *vācas*<sup>1</sup> *tác*<sup>2</sup> *cin*<sup>3</sup> *na*<sup>4</sup> *ohase*<sup>5</sup> where *cid* may have been a neuter pronoun, expressing a nuance of humble reserve: "Thou observest<sup>5</sup> this<sup>2</sup> word<sup>1</sup> of ours<sup>5</sup> whatever it is (worth)<sup>3</sup>" — we might compare such Greek instances as Xen. Oec. 7, 39 ἡ γὰρ ἐμὴ φυλακὴ ... γελοία τις ἂν οἶμαι φαίνεται and the extenuating function of the Lat. *quidam*<sup>164</sup>) —; RV. 1, 37, 15 *vísvaṃ cid áyuh* (Sāyana: *sarvam api*) "a whole life-time (< of any length, however long it may be)".

It may further be remembered that the acc. n. of pronominal stems, in a variety of constructions, tended to assume adverbial value — Gr. *τί* "how? why? wherefore?"; Skt. *tat* "therefore" — and, under certain circumstances replaced another case: Gr. Xen. Anab. 1, 3, 4 εἰ τι δέοιτο as against δέομαι λόγον<sup>165</sup>). The Gr. *τι* came to convey such meanings as "in any degree, at all, in part". An interpretation "in any (some) respect, anyhow" seems plausible in passages like RV. 1, 32, 8; 84, 9 *yás cid* "who in any respect" > "whoever" (AV. 18, 2 15); RV. 1, 25, 1 *yác*<sup>1</sup> *cid*<sup>2</sup> *dhi*<sup>3</sup> *te*<sup>4</sup> ... *varuṇa*<sup>5</sup> *vratám*<sup>6</sup> | *minīmási*<sup>7</sup> *d'ávi-dyavi*<sup>8</sup> ... "if<sup>1</sup> we in any respect<sup>2</sup> transgress<sup>7</sup>, O Varuṇa<sup>5</sup>, Thine ordinances<sup>6</sup> every day<sup>8</sup> ..."; AV. 7, 18, 2. Hence the 'indefinite' value of phrases like *yathā cit* RV. 5, 79, 1; 56, 2 (where *cid* could have been an accus.); *yadi cit* AV. 5, 2, 4; *anyám* ... *kám cit* AV. 6, 20, 1 etc. In their translation of the Atharvaveda Whitney and Lanman frequently suggest taking the adverbial *cit* for a substitute of a pro-

<sup>163</sup>) One might compare the 'emphasizing' force of *τις τι* in Greek: x 45 ὅσος τις χρυσός "what store of gold"; Thuc. 8, 3 στρατῷ τινι "with considerable forces"; Γ 220 φαίης κε ζήκοτόν τέ τιν' ἔμμεναι "you would have deemed him a, I cannot say precisely how (> a very), churlish man" (Kühner-Gerth, o.c., II, 1, p. 663 f.). — RV. 1, 185, 9 *bhūri cit* (and 3, 39, 8 adverbial): the adverbial *πολύ τι* "much".

<sup>164</sup>) I also refer to Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 215.

<sup>165</sup>) I must, for reasons of space, refer to Kühner-Gerth, o.c., II, 1, p. 309 f.; Schwyzer-Debrunner, o.c., II, p. 77; Reichelt, Awest. Elementarbuch, p. 231; Renou, Gramm. sanscrite, p. 156, etc.

nominal case form; almost always this interpretation suits the context remarkably well <sup>166</sup>): 4, 6, 4 "(he hurled at you) from<sup>3</sup> some<sup>2</sup> crooked<sup>1</sup> bow<sup>4</sup>": *vakrác<sup>1</sup> cid<sup>2</sup> ádhi<sup>3</sup> dhánvanah<sup>4</sup>*; 21, 5 *iccl imi<sup>1</sup> hrdā<sup>2</sup> mánasā<sup>3</sup> cid<sup>4</sup> indram<sup>5</sup>* "with whatever<sup>4</sup> heart<sup>2</sup> (and) mind<sup>3</sup> I seek<sup>1</sup> Indra<sup>5</sup>"; 5, 27, 4 *eti<sup>1</sup> ... ghrtā<sup>2</sup> cid<sup>3</sup>* "he comes<sup>1</sup> ... unto various<sup>3</sup> ghees<sup>2</sup>"; 6, 3, 3; 7, 14, 4 *párijmā cid* ... "any wanderer ...". 92, 1; cf. also 9, 9, 7; 10, 23; 14, 2, 47; and 18, 2, 14; 16; 17 *tāmś it* <sup>167</sup>).

A perusal of the relevant Ancient Iranian passages gives us the same impression. As to O.Pers. <sup>168</sup>), Dar. Beh. a 14 *yaθā<sup>1</sup> paruvam<sup>2</sup>čiy<sup>3</sup> avaθā<sup>4</sup>* "as formerly<sup>2</sup>, however it was<sup>3</sup>, thus"; 58 *aniyaščiy* "other whatever", in etymologically 'literal' translations which must, of course, be checked in translating <sup>169</sup>). Xer. Pers. a 20 the particle does not mean "auch (gleichfalls)" <sup>170</sup>), but serves to "résumer un ensemble" (Meillet-Benveniste): "my kingdom and what I have achieved and what my father has achieved, that, whatever it be (which may come to "tout cela", M.-B.: *avaščiy*) must be protected by Ahuramazdā". The particle *kā*, being an ancient instr. sg. (< \**kū*) has a similar value: Dar. Beh. a 65 *tuvam kā* "you (whoever you may be)". It corresponds to the Gr. *πω* "at all, ever"; cf. also Goth. *he* "irgendwie" <sup>171</sup>). — The Av. *cit* in the 'emphatic' sense of "even, also,

<sup>166</sup>) To a certain extent the syntactic equivalence of *tatra* and other adverbs with a limited number of case forms (*tatra vane*, *tatra gacchati*) might be compared.

<sup>167</sup>) I also refer to Grassmann, o.c., 455, 4.

<sup>168</sup>) Where *cid* > *čiy*. See also A. Meillet-E. Benveniste, *Grammaire du vieux-perse*, Paris 1931, p. 194 f.; W. Hinz, *Altpersischer Wortschatz*, Leipzig 1942, p. 52.

<sup>169</sup>) This phrase, which is frequent in Avestan (cf. e.g. Yt. 19, 87; Vend. 18, 73; Yt. 15, 54; Vend. 18, 32), and which is represented in Anc.Ind. by *anya-ka-cit* and similar combinations, no doubt had a wide distribution among the ancients. It referred to a complementary entity (or to c. entities) of unspecified individuality. Cf. also the Gr. phrase *ἄλλο τι* "anything else" which is used in interrog. sentences: Hdt. 2, 14 *ἄλλο τι ἢ ... πεινῆσουσι*; "will they not be starved?"; Plato, Grg. 495c *ἄλλο τι οὐν ... ἔλεγε*; "did not you say?" The Lat. *aliōquī* "in another respect, otherwise" represents an abl. of *alius quis*; cf. e.g. Hor. Sat. 1, 4, 4 *sicarius aut alioqui famosus* (a: *alia qua re*). For *alius quis*: Plaut. Most. 1055.

<sup>170</sup>) Bartholomae, *Altiran. Wtb.* 589.

<sup>171</sup>) Cf. also Lat. *quī*: Plaut. Pseud. 160 *num qui minus ...* "does (that make me) any less ...?"; Trin. 120 *si qui probiorem facere possis*; Asin. 557 *edepol virtutes qui tuas non possis concludare sic ut ego possim*.

further(more)" (cf. e.g. Yt. 10, 109 f.; 13, 146 f.; 14, 33; 46; 16, 10) may also be explained from the indefinite value "in any way, anyway, anyhow". The particle often accompanies the last member of a series or a rather vague term: cf. Yt. 10, 84 "whom the chief of the village invokes for help, whom the lord of the house ..., whom a poor man (refugee), not definitely indicated and under circumstances not described specifically (*driyūščiū*) ..."; it also appears in connection with words for "all", "whence", "as, like" etc. which are often accompanied by indefinite pronouns or particles. — The repeated *cit* ... *cit*, like the corresponding Vedic *cid* ... *cid*, has often been considered an equivalent of our "not only ... but also (cum ... tum)" <sup>172</sup>). I would however prefer to interpret passages like RV. 6, 28, 6 in the above manner: *medayathā*<sup>1</sup> *kṛśám*<sup>2</sup> *cid*<sup>3</sup> *āsrīrām*<sup>4</sup> *cit*<sup>5</sup> *kṛṇuthā*<sup>6</sup> *suprá-tīkam*<sup>7</sup> "fatten<sup>1</sup> whatever<sup>3</sup> is lean<sup>2</sup>; make<sup>6</sup> of good aspect<sup>7</sup> whatever<sup>5</sup> does not look prosperous<sup>4</sup>" — cf. also instances like AV. 18, 3, 23 —; similarly RV. 2, 38, 2 f. (a succession of 5 *cid*'s, emphasizing that the god's performances do not admit of a detailed description, that they make their presence felt under any circumstance); Av. Yt. 10, 137; 39 f. <sup>173</sup>).

This unequivocally 'indefinite' use of these stereotyped case forms shows that this force belonged to simple \**k<sup>ui</sup>*- and \**k<sup>uo</sup>*- in early times.

So the conclusion seems to be that the various indefinite nuances of *kaś cid* — cf. e.g. RV. 1, 37, 13 *śṛṇóti*<sup>1</sup> *káś*<sup>2</sup> *cid*<sup>3</sup> *eṣám*<sup>4</sup> "manch einer<sup>2, 3</sup> hört<sup>1</sup> sie<sup>4</sup>" (Geldner); 1, 116, 3 *túgro*<sup>1</sup> *ha*<sup>2</sup> *bhuṣyám*<sup>3</sup> *āsvino*<sup>4</sup> *dameghē*<sup>5</sup> *rayim*<sup>6</sup> *ná*<sup>7</sup> *kás*<sup>8</sup> *cin*<sup>9</sup> *mamṛvāṇ*<sup>10</sup> *áāhāḥ*<sup>11</sup> "T.<sup>1</sup> hatte den Bh.<sup>3</sup> in der Wassermasse<sup>5</sup> zurückgelassen<sup>11</sup>, ihr Áśvin<sup>4</sup>, wie<sup>7</sup> irgend<sup>8, 9</sup> ein Verstorbener<sup>10</sup> sein. Vermögen<sup>6</sup>" — may be explained from an originally indefinite *ka*-, modified by *cid*. The phrase *ya-ka-cid* may be considered to represent this *ka-cid* preceded by *ya*-. ŚatBr. 14, 6, 7, 5 *yó*<sup>1</sup> *vā*<sup>2</sup> *idám*<sup>3</sup> *káś*<sup>4</sup> *cid*<sup>5</sup> *brūyāt*<sup>6</sup> "anyone<sup>1, 4, 5</sup> might say<sup>6</sup> this<sup>3</sup>"; Manu 8, 69 *anubkāvī*<sup>1</sup> *tu*<sup>2</sup> *yaḥ*<sup>3</sup> *kaś*<sup>4</sup> *cit*<sup>5</sup> *kuryāt*<sup>6</sup> *sākṣyam*<sup>7</sup> "any person whatsoever<sup>3, 4, 5</sup>, who is an eye-witness<sup>1</sup> may give<sup>6</sup> evidence<sup>7</sup>", where it is an emphatic generalizing indefinite; Manu 2, 7 *yaḥ*<sup>1</sup> *kaś*<sup>2</sup> *cit*<sup>3</sup> ... *dharmo*<sup>4</sup> *manunā*<sup>5</sup> *parikīrtitaḥ*<sup>6</sup> | *sa*<sup>7</sup> *sarvo*<sup>8</sup> *bhihito*<sup>9</sup> *vede*<sup>10</sup> "whatever<sup>1, 2, 3</sup>

<sup>172</sup>) Cf. Petrograd Dict. II, 1026; Bartholomae, o.c., 590; Renou, Gramm. védique, p. 376. Otherwise: Grassmann, o.c., 455.

<sup>173</sup>) This is not to contend that the 'meaning' of the particle has remained unaltered.

law<sup>4</sup> has been ordained<sup>6</sup> by Manu<sup>5</sup>, that<sup>7</sup> has been completely<sup>8</sup> explained<sup>9</sup> in the Veda<sup>10</sup>", where it is a 'relative'.

Some words remain to be said on the confused account given by Hirt<sup>174</sup>). Starting from the unproved assumption that the *\*k<sup>ue</sup>*- stem originally was interrogative he tries to show that it previously was deictic-anaphoric in character. His arguments, the supposedly original unity of *\*k<sup>ue</sup>*- and the particle *\*k<sup>ue</sup>*<sup>175</sup>), and the so-called 'relative Anschluß' by means of *qui* in Latin (cf. e.g. Plaut. Rud. 431)<sup>176</sup>), fail to convince me: the identity mentioned first is, it is true, assumed by many scholars, but must be considered dubious, anyhow *\*k<sup>ue</sup>* was not 'deictic' in the sense of the term adopted by Hirt; the 'relative Anschluß' may be considered a special development of a wide-spread type of 'relative' construction. To Hirt's subsequent expatiations upon the supposed group or 'compound relative' *\*i<sup>o</sup>sk<sup>ue</sup>* I must likewise object. It is true that in Greek  $\tau\epsilon$  often follows  $\delta\varsigma$  but it cannot be maintained that  $\delta\varsigma \tau\epsilon$  is a fixed phrase, the second element of which is a strengthening particle, or that it is a group without a special meaning<sup>177</sup>). The combination  $\delta\varsigma \tau\iota\varsigma$  may not be put on a par with  $\delta\varsigma \tau\epsilon$ , and cannot be made an argument for vindicating the existence of a fixed group *\*i<sup>o</sup>sk<sup>ue</sup>* in Orig. I.E., for which the supposed parallelism between  $\delta\varsigma \tau\epsilon$ , *quisque*, *yas kaś ca* cannot be a piece of evidence either. That *quisque* should have replaced this *\*i<sup>o</sup>sk<sup>ue</sup>* is a merely arbitrary assumption. Since *\*i<sup>o</sup>sk<sup>ue</sup>* is entirely in the air, it would be superfluous to raise objections to Hirt's using the inflections of  $\delta\varsigma \tau\epsilon$ ,  $\delta\varsigma \tau\iota\varsigma$  and similar phrases as an argument for his thesis that in some language the former, elsewhere the latter part of it, or of its "fuller form" *\*i<sup>o</sup>sk<sup>ue</sup>is*, was lost.

Utrecht

J. GONDA

<sup>174</sup>) Hirt, Indogerm. Gram., VII, p. 133 ff.

<sup>175</sup>) See Mnemosyne, N.S. vol. VII, p. 181.

<sup>176</sup>) See Lingua IV, p. 23.

<sup>177</sup>) See Mnemosyne, vol. VII, p. 202. ff.