

A pragmatic analysis of the Ṛgvedic injunctive

Ian Hollenbaugh
hian@wustl.edu

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS
Department of Classics | Program of Linguistics

(F)ASAL-12
9 April 2022

It is understood that the concepts are purely differential and defined not by their positive content but negatively by their relations with other terms of the system. Their most precise characteristic is in being what the others are not. – Saussure (1916 [1959]:117)

1 Introduction

- Prior accounts
- Outstanding problems
- Research questions

2 Analysis

- Non-discourse based interpretation
- Partial blocking: Data
- Partial blocking: Horn strategies
- Contextual neutralizations
- Vagueness

3 Conclusion

Introduction

- The Vedic “injunctive” consists formally of the indicative past tenses minus their augment. For example, to $\sqrt{\text{kr}}$ ‘make’:

ipf. ind. $\acute{a}\text{-kr}\grave{\text{ṛ}}\text{ṇo-t}$ \Rightarrow pres. inj. $\text{kr}\grave{\text{ṛ}}\acute{\text{o-t}}$
 aor. ind. $\acute{á}\text{-kar}$ \Rightarrow aor. inj. $\acute{k}\acute{á}\text{r}$

- Basically an aspect stem + agreement morphemes (person, number, voice).
- It was traditionally classified as a mood (Avery 1885, Macdonell 1916:349–52, Hoffmann 1967:29).

Attested interpretations of the Ṛgvedic injunctive

- The injunctive is “undifferentiated” (Renou 1952:368–9) or “un(der)specified” (Kiparsky 2005, 1968) for tense and mood.
 - ▶ present, typically generic-habitual (= “gnomic” or “timeless”) (e.g., *RV* II.5.3b, 5b, VII.104.20d)
 - ▶ past, typically non-recent (e.g., *RV* II.11.18d, 13.9c)
 - ▶ modal, which may have the character of:
 - imperative (e.g., *RV* II.24.1d, VIII.17.1c)
 - optative (e.g., *RV* I.17.6b, V.50.1d)
 - “subjunctive,” almost always = future (e.g., *RV* VII.86.2d)

Conjunction reduction

- Context is typically said to determine which reading of the injunctive is understood in any given utterance.
 - ▶ So Macdonell 1916:349–50, Renou 1952:369, and Kiparsky 1968.
- Kiparsky (1968:35–8): Formulated as a syntactic phenomenon (conjunction reduction), whereby “both tense and mood were in conjoined structures neutralized by the injunctive.”
 - ▶ Inj. following an indicative aorist or imperfect \Rightarrow past interpretation (e.g., *RV* V.32.1).
 - ▶ Inj. following an indicative present \Rightarrow presential (e.g., I.165.10d).
 - ▶ Inj. following a marked modal \Rightarrow modal interpretation.
(See Kiparsky 2005:221–2 for examples).

Anaphoric determination

- Problem: The linear order MARKED INDICATIVE/MODAL + INJUNCTIVE has in fact nearly as many exceptions as not.
- Kiparsky's (2005:225) solution:
 - ▶ “The temporal/modal interpretation of injunctives is analogous to determining the antecedent of a pronoun.”
 - ▶ Depends on discourse context and common ground.

Injunctive preceding indicative/modal forms

(1) *srjó*_[INJ.] *mahīr indra yā ápinvah*_[IND.] (RV II.11.2a).

'You **released**_[INJ.] the great (waters), Indra, which you **swelled**_[IND.]'.

(2) *índro dāśad*_[INJ.] *dāśúṣe hānti*_[IND.] *vṛtrám* (RV II.19.4b)

'Indra **serves**_[INJ.] [**or served?**] his servant [=Manu]: he **smashes**_[IND.] Vṛtra [/Obstacle]'.

(3) *prá brahmāṅo ángiraso nakṣanta*_[INJ.] *prá krandanúr nabhaníyasya vetu*_[IPV.] (RV VII.42.1ab).

'The Angirasas, possessors of the sacred formulation, **are reaching forth**_[INJ.]. **Let** the roar of (the hymn? fire? soma?) that is set to burst out **go questing forth**_[IPV.]'.

Remaining problems (1)

- Injunctive often co-occurs with forms specified for mood or tense without matching in interpretation.
- The difference in form seems to signal a difference in meaning.

Non-anaphoric modal interpretations of the inj.

- (4) **ā yāhi**_[IPV.] *vānasā sahā gāvah* **sacanta**_[INJ.] *vartanīm yád ūdhabhiḥ*
 (RV X.172.1).

‘**Drive here**_[IPV.] along with your longing. The cows **follow**_[INJ.] your track, when (they have given milk) with their udders’.

- (5) *bhāgo vā góbhir aryamém* **anajyāt**_[OPT.] *só asmai cārus*
chadayad_[INJ.] *utá syāt*_[OPT.] (RV X.31.4cd).

‘Or Bhaga (and) Aryaman **should anoint**_[OPT.] it [=hymn] with cows. It [=hymn] **seems**_[INJ.] dear to him [=Agni] and so it **should be**_[OPT.]’ (tr. Jamison 2015–:ad loc).

Non-anaphoric temporal interpretations of the inj.

- (6) *prá_indrāgníbyām suvacasyām iyarmi_[IND.] síndhāv iva
 prá_īrayam_[INJ.] nāvam arkaíḥ (RV X.116.9ab).*

'I send forth_[IND.] my eloquent speech to Indra and to Agni;
 like a boat upon a river I sent it forth_[INJ.] with my chants.'

- (7) *uttānāyām ajanayan_[IND.] súsūtam bhúvad_[INJ.] agníḥ
 purupésāsu gárbhaḥ (RV II.10.3ab).*

'In her with (legs) agape [=kindling sticks] they
 engendered_[IND.] him whose birth is easy. Agni becomes_[INJ.]
 the embryo in the (women) of many ornaments [=logs]' (cd
 has pres.ind. *aktúnā... vasati* 'he dwells by night').

Remaining problems (2)

- There are over 70 examples of an injunctive occurring as the first verb in a hymn.
- In discourse-initial position, it is not clear what the injunctive is supposed to mean:
 - ▶ Is it past or present referring?
 - ▶ Is it modal?
 - ▶ How does it pick out its temporal/modal “antecedent”?

Non-anaphoric inj.: hymn-initial performative use

- This is particularly clear in the case of performatives, which are regularly injunctive (Hoffmann 1967:251–5, 269 “Koinzidenzfall”).

(8) *ápūrviyā purutāmāni asmai mahé vīrāya tavāse turāya
virapśīne vajrīṇe śāṃtamāni vácāṃsi āsā sthāvīrāya
takṣam*_[INJ.] (RV VI.32.1).

‘For him I (**hereby**) **fashion**_[INJ.] with my mouth these words, unprecedented, best of many, most wealful— for the great hero, powerful and precipitous, conferring abundance, bearing the mace, stalwart’.

Remaining problems (3)

- Return to indicative after “conjunction reduction.”

(9) *āvīr bhāvann úd atiṣṭhat*_[IND.] *parāvṛk*
*prāti śronā sthād*_[INJ.] *vī anág acaṣṭa*_[IND.] (RV II.15.7bc).

‘Becoming manifest, he **stood up**_[IND.]—he who was shunned:
 The lame one **stood firm**_[INJ.]; the blind one **saw**
clearly_[IND.]’.

- Other such examples include: with past tenses RV II.13.9, 15.8, 17.2, VI.32.2, VIII.32.25; with pres. ind. IX.92.3.

Questions to be addressed

- The present investigation gives special attention to hymn-initial injunctives, asking:
 - ▶ What factors must be at work to determine the meaning of an injunctive in discourse-initial position?
 - ▶ What sort of utterance-initial “common ground” can exist between speaker and hearer?
 - ▶ What text-specific factors motivate the use of the injunctive?

Questions to be addressed

- I also look at non-anaphoric determination of the meaning of the injunctive:
 - ▶ In what ways do pragmatic pressures from the rest of the verbal system give rise to special uses of the injunctive (e.g., performative)?
 - ▶ How does choice of aspect stem correlate with augmentation?
- I thus aim to refine our understanding of how a form unspecified for tense and mood is interpreted in any given utterance.

Presuppositions: Text type and assumed common ground

- Text type is crucial in establishing common ground utterance initially.
- To determine the injunctive's temporal/modal reference hymn initially, the hearer must understand:
 - ▶ Who the subject of the hymn is, which carries presuppositions about when certain events are likely to be happening.
 - ▶ Whether we are talking about a ritual or mythical event, or both.

Agni hymns: present time reference

- With the aorist injunctive, the meaning may be:
 - ▶ recent past/resultative, of the type *didhiṣāyyaḥ bhūt* 'has become desirable to install' (*RV* II.4.1c; cf. similarly X.46.1c)
 - ▶ performative, of the type *áchā... gāsi* 'here I sing' (*RV* V.25.1ab)
- With the present injunctive, the meaning may be:
 - ▶ reportive (e.g., *agnīm nárah... janayanta* 'men (hereby) give birth to Agni', *RV* VII.1.1ab)
 - ▶ progressive (e.g., *prá... navanta* '(flames) are bellowing out', *RV* X.176.1b) or stative (e.g., *sīdat* 'sits, is seated', *RV* X.46.1b)

Performative and reportive meanings

- **performative** \Rightarrow type *I now pronounce you legally wed.*
 - ▶ The speech act itself imposes some change on the state of the world.
 - ▶ Typically 1st person, though others are possible.
 - ▶ Regularly expressed in the *Ṛgveda* by the aorist injunctive (upwards of 40 occurrences) or present indicative.
 - ▶ Type aor. inj. *prá nú vocam* 'I now proclaim'.

Performative and reportive meanings

■ reportive ⇒ type *She shoots, she scores!*

- ▶ Narrates events as they happen in the present moment (without the speech act effecting a change on the world).
- ▶ Typically 3rd person, sometimes 2nd.
- ▶ Regularly expressed in the *Ṛgveda* by the present injunctive (at least 12 occurrences), the present indicative, or rarely the aorist injunctive.
- ▶ E.g., pres. inj. *nūnám sṛjat* 'now he discharges' (*RV* VII.104.20d).

Vague time reference: Agni's installation

- Besides Agni's ritual installation, other hymns open with a reference to his *primal* installation in the remote (mythic) past. (e.g., aor.inj. *RV* I.148.1a or pres.inj. *RV* VI.7.1d).
- Often there is ambiguity about which installation is referred to (primal or ritual):

(10) *ayám jāyata mānuṣo dhārīmaṇi* (*RV* I.128.1a).

'This one [=Agni] **was/is born** here on the foundation of Manu [/man]'

Soma hymns: present time reference

- Soma hymns beginning in injunctives likewise tend to belong to the ritual present, with either:
 - ▶ a resultative aorist injunctive (e.g., *RV* IX.74.1a) or perfect injunctive (e.g., *RV* I.91.1a)
 - ▶ a performative/reportive use of the aorist injunctive (e.g., *RV* IX.92.1b, 102.1c).

Indra hymns: past time reference

- By contrast, Indra hymns beginning with injunctives tend to be past referring, whether aorist (e.g., *RV* I.63.1b) or present (e.g., *RV* IV.17.1).
- Unlike the Agni hymns, ambiguity with non-past interpretation seldom arises, since Indra's great deeds are essentially confined to mythic time, even when ritually relevant.
 - ▶ In contrast to Agni, Indra had only one birth, so when the injunctive *jāniṣṭhāḥ* 'you were born' is used of Indra at *RV* X.73.1a, or when other events of his birth are described (e.g., *RV* VIII.77.1b), the generic reading is not available as it is in the Agni hymns just discussed.

Dawn hymns: present time reference *indicative*

- Interestingly, the openings to Dawn hymns almost exclusively employ the aorist and present *indicative* (as well as imperatives) rather than injunctives.
- This may be explained by the fact that Dawn hymns are invariably concerned with the present moment—*this* dawn happening today.
- But dawn is also something that occurs *every* day, so in principle the injunctive could be taken to refer to her rising habitually (as indeed it does at *RV* V.45.1–3 (All-Gods hymn)).
- Hence the indicative is used to rule out any ambiguity about which dawn is being referred to (today's or every day's), which the injunctive would leave unspecified.

Local summary

- The injunctive is typically avoided at the beginning of hymns if, for reasons of subject matter and world knowledge, its use would result in unwanted temporal or modal ambiguity (as in the Dawn hymns).
- It is available for use otherwise, in which case it can have either past or present reference, according as is most suited to the common ground assumed to be shared between speaker and hearer.
- Takeaway: Knowledge of the Vedic pantheon and ritual practice is essential to interpreting the injunctive.

Modal injunctives are of restricted occurrence

- Though Kiparsky (2005:221–2) presents the injunctive as having any temporal or modal interpretation, its modal uses are in fact blocked wherever possible by the marked modal forms (Hoffmann 1967:236–64, 268–9).
- Such interpretations are only found for verbs that lack marked modal equivalents (e.g., *dāḥ* 'give!').

Blocking of the injunctive

- The principal observation to be made from a pragmatic point-of-view is that there is blocking on two fronts:
 - ▶ Non-injunctive modal categories tend to apply wherever they can.
 - ▶ The indicative is used to avoid ambiguity that is liable to arise from the inherent vagueness of the injunctive, particularly with respect to its generic, performative/reportive, and modal uses.

Only present reference is ambiguous

- In a robustly narrative or mythic context, an injunctive can often be substituted for the corresponding past indicative, even in the absence of any marked indicative forms in the local discourse.
- This is because the other injunctive readings only apply to the present time, so there is no risk of ambiguity:
 - ▶ There are no past modal readings of the injunctive (of the type 'should have done', vel sim.), nor do we typically find modal uses of the injunctive in subordinate clauses.
 - ▶ Performatives/reportives are definitionally presential, and generic-habituals are likewise always non-past referring.

Only present reference is ambiguous

- From the point-of-view of the present moment, if a speaker chooses *not* to use the indicative of the aorist or present and instead uses a corresponding injunctive, then two possibilities emerge:
 - ▶ The context is so clearly presential that no mistake can be made about what is meant (as in the ritual installation of Agni).
 - ▶ The injunctive has been selected to express some special meaning to which the indicative is ill-suited (e.g., performative aorist).

Only present reference is ambiguous

- One special interpretation of the injunctive is the performative/reportive.
- When a speaker uses an injunctive like *prá vocam*, the hearer reasons that, if they had meant 'I have proclaimed' they would have used the form most strongly associated with this meaning, ind. *prá avocam*, so something else must be meant instead (performative).
- Thus the injunctive receives its interpretation pragmatically here, irrespective of discourse context.

Aorist inj. vs. ind. in Vedic

■ Performative injunctives vs. non-performative indicatives in the *RV*

prá vocam 'I (hereby) proclaim' (e.g., *RV* I.32.1a)

prá avocam 'I have proclaimed' (*RV* IV.45.7a)

takṣam 'I (hereby) fashion' (*RV* VI.32.1d)

átakṣan 'they have fashioned' (*RV* II.31.7b)

Generic-habitual injunctive vs. preterital indicative

- (11) *út súvar gād*_[INJ.]...
*ā súriyo aruhac*_[IND.] *chukráṃ árṇo áyukta*_[IND.] *yád dharíto*
vītáprṣṭhāḥ (RV V.45.1c, 10ab).

'The (ideal) Sun **comes up**_[INJ.]... The Sun (of today) **has mounted**_[IND.] the gleaming flood, now that he **has yoked**_[IND.] his golden, straight-backed (horses)'.
 (See Jamison and Brereton's (2014:719) introduction to this hymn)

Local summary

- The interpretation of the injunctive as performative/reportive or generic-habitual thus depends on one's awareness that it is *not* the indicative.
- And so, by purely pragmatic (rather than contextual) means, the injunctive's most distinctive readings arise.

Horn strategies

- Assuming Horn's (1984) Q(uality) and R(elation) principles, many terms can be understood to have their meanings via competition with other forms.
 - ▶ Q Principle (hearer based): Make your contribution sufficient. Say as much as you can (given R).
 - ▶ R Principle (speaker based): Make your contribution necessary. Say no more than you must (given Q).
- When a speaker uses form B, the addressee reasons that they've opted for that form to express something which is not typical of form A.

Partial blocking: *kill* vs. *cause to die*

- This partial blocking process is represented as a 2×2 game between the speaker's preference for short, unmarked forms (vertical arrows) and hearer's preference for stereotypical, unmarked meanings (horizontal arrows).

	m_1 : direct		m_2 : indirect
f_1 : <i>kill</i>	✓	←	✗
	↑		↑
f_2 : <i>cause to die</i>	✗	←	✓

- “True, there is a better form (f_1), but *not* given meaning m_2 . Similarly, there is a better meaning (m_1), but *not* given form f_2 ” (Grønn 2007).

Application to TAM systems

- Grønn (2008) applies Blutner's (2000) framework of bidirectional optimality theory (OT) to the development of Russian aspectual contrast.

	m ₁ : [incomplete]		m ₂ : [complete]
f ₁ : <i>čitat' knigu</i> (Ipfv.)	✓	←	✗
	↑		↑
f ₂ : <i>pročitat' knigu</i> (Pfv.)	✗	←	✓

Application to TAM

- Lebanese Arabic: An indicative marker *b-* has evolved from an old progressive marker (Cohen 1984:294).
- Marked indicative *b-yišrab* 'he drinks' vs. unmarked *yišrab* 'may he drink' (vel sim.).
- Historically the *b*-progressive forms were used particularly in present indicative contexts, while the unmarked forms were used elsewhere (Stage A).
- Over time, this was reinterpreted as a modal/non-modal contrast (Stage B).

Diachronic pragmatics: Lebanese indicative marker

STAGE A: 15TH C. LEVANTINE

	m ₁ : [elsewhere]		m ₂ : [prog. ind.]
f ₁ : <i>yišrab</i>	✓	←	✗
	↑		↑
f ₂ : <i>b-yišrab</i>	✗	←	✓



STAGE B: MODERN LEBANESE

	m ₁ : [non-modal]		m ₂ : [modal]
f ₁ : <i>b-yišrab</i>	✓	←	✗
	↑		↑
f ₂ : <i>yišrab</i>	✗	←	✓

Past reference by contrast to the marked present

- The Vedic present injunctive is typically interpreted as past-referring in contrast to the present indicative.

	[non-past]		[past]
<i>hán-ti</i>	✓	←	X
	↑		↑
<i>hán(-t)</i>	X	←	✓

Performative/reportive by contrast to augmented forms

- The performative/reportive reading of the injunctive relies on knowledge that the speaker could have used the augmented indicative, but chose not to. Hence, *prá vócam* 'I proclaim'.

	[past]		[non-past]
<i>prá á-voc-am</i>	✓	←	✗
	↑		↑
<i>prá vócam</i>	✗	←	✓

Modal meaning blocked where possible

- For verbs with viable marked modals, the modal uses of the injunctive are blocked (excluding generic-habitual, which has no particular morphological exponent).

	[modal]		[non-modal]
<i>han-a-t(i)</i>	✓	←	✗
<i>han-tu</i>	↑		↑
<i>hán(-t)</i>	✗	←	✓

Modal meaning arises by contrast to indicatives

- In Vedic, the augment is a marker of indicative mood.
- For verbs with modal injunctives, such as *dā̃ḥ* 'give!', the augment excludes these modal readings: *ádā̃ḥ* 'you have given' (e.g., *RV* X.15.12c).

	[non-modal]		[modal]
<i>á-dā-s</i>	✓	←	✗
	↑		↑
<i>dā-s</i>	✗	←	✓

Local summary

■ So, the injunctive has:

- ▶ Preterital meaning **by contrast** with the marked present tense.
- ▶ Presential meaning (performative and reportive-progressive) **by contrast** with marked past tenses.
- ▶ Modal meaning **by contrast** to marked indicatives (only where no marked modal exists).
 - *Modal* includes the generic-habitual interpretation (cf. Boneh and Doron 2008, 2010).

Inconsistent mixing of the injunctive and indicative

- Partially consistent: The present injunctive is relatively uncommon in past narration (about 15% of the time in *RV* II, as compared to the imperfect 85% of the time; see Hollenbaugh 2021:263).

(12) *āvīr bhāvann úd atiṣṭhat*_[IPF.IND.] *parāvṛk*
*prāti śronā sthād*_[AOR.INJ.] *vī anág acaṣṭa*_[IPF.IND.] (*RV*
 II.15.7bc).

‘Becoming manifest, he **stood up**_[IPF.IND.]—he who was shunned:

The lame one **stood firm**_[AOR.INJ.]; the blind one **saw clearly**_[IPF.IND.]’ (similarly *RV* II.17.2, 24.14, IX.92.5cd).

Aor. inj. = remote past; aor. ind. = resultative

- The aorist in past narration is *regularly* augmentless (=injunctive) (see Hollenbaugh 2021:195).
- This in part underlies Avery's (1885) observation that when the injunctive is used "in a historical sense" (= past narrative) the distinction "between imperfect and aorist" tends to be "obliterate[d]."
- As a case example, the aorist injunctive *kāḥ* is used almost exclusively in "historical" meaning ('made'), whereas its indicative counterpart *ākaḥ* almost always means 'has made'.

Neutralization of aspect in past narration

- It is precisely in “historical” contexts that the aorist injunctive does not compete with modal, generic, or performative readings. Ambiguity therefore does not arise in such contexts.
- From the perspective of the present moment, on the other hand, the aorist injunctive is ambiguous and typically its augmented counterpart is called for to specify a non-modal/non-generic meaning.
- Accordingly, the augment regularly indicates a resultative perfect reading of the aorist (see Hollenbaugh 2021:186–7), so using it in past narration would potentially be misleading.

Neutralization of aspect in past narration

- Therefore the augment is typically avoided in past narration when the aorist is used, irrespective of other considerations.
- This gives the *appearance* that the aorist injunctive has lost its aspectual distinction from the imperfect/present injunctive in “historical” contexts.

(13) *āvīr bhāvann úd atiṣṭhat*_[IPF.IND.] *parāvṛk*
*prāti śronā sthād*_[AOR.INJ.] *vī anág acaṣṭa*_[IPF.IND.] (RV
 II.15.7bc).

‘Becoming manifest, he **stood up**_[IPF.IND.]—he who was shunned:

The lame one **stood firm**_[AOR.INJ.]; the blind one **saw clearly**_[IPF.IND.]’ (similarly RV II.17.2, 24.14, IX.92.5cd).

Neutralization of aspect in past narration

- The neutralization of aspect in narrative contexts can be captured as follows, using $\sqrt{\text{kr}}$ 'make' as an example:

	[canonical pfv.]		[resultative pfv.]
<i>kár</i>	✓	←	✗
	↑		↑
<i>ákar</i>	✗	←	✓

Neutralization of aspect in performative/reportive uses

(14) *prá te yakṣi*_[AOR.INJ.] *prá te iyarmi*_[PRES.IND.] *mánma* (RV X.4.1a).

'I **begin the sacrifice**_[AOR.INJ.] to you and I **propel**_[PRES.IND.] my thought to you' (similarly RV X.85.25ab, in the opposite order).

Deliberate vagueness

- The poets often seem to seize upon the injunctive's ambiguity of time reference for poetic effect, in order to more economically evoke the mythic past in the ritual present or eternal reality of the gods.

(15) *nū ca purā ca sádanam rayīṅām jātásya ca jáyamānasya ca kṣām satás ca gopām bhávataś ca bhūrér devā agníṃ dhārayan*_[INJ.] *draviṇodām* (RV 1.96.7).

'Both now and before the seat of riches, the ground of what has been born and is being born, the herdsman of what is and of much coming into being—Agni, the wealth-giver, **do/did** the gods **uphold**_[INJ.]'.

Deliberate vagueness (Indra speaking)

- (16) *ahám dām_[INJ.] gr̥ṇaté pūrvyaṃ vāsu ahám bráhma
 kr̥ṇavam_[INJ.] máhyaṃ várdhanam
 ahám bhuvam_[INJ.] yájamānasya coditá áyajvanaḥ sākṣi_[INJ.]
 víśvasmin bháre (RV X.49.1).*

'I gave/give_[INJ.] the foremost good to the singer. I made/make_[INJ.] the sacred formulation a strengthener for me.

I became/become/am regularly_[INJ.] the inciter of the sacrificer. I have vanquished/vanquish_[INJ.] the non-sacrificers in every contest' (similarly RV X.48.1a).

Vagueness from formal ambiguity

- (17) *imám vidhánto apám sadhásthe dvitādadhur*_[PF.? INJ.? IND.?]
bhṛgavo vikṣv āyóḥ (RV II.4.2ab).

‘This one here—having done honor (to him) in the seat of the waters—once again the Bhṛgus (**have**)
installed/install_[PF.? INJ.? IND.?] among the clans of Āyu’.

Vagueness and the meaning of the injunctive

- The Ṛgvedic poets' use of vagueness is a literary device, but one that relies on Gricean principles.
- In order to get more temporal mileage out of the injunctive, the speaker needs to defy the hearer's expectation that context will establish the injunctive's antecedent, instead using the injunctive precisely where they know it is least cooperative to do so, and therefore maximally ambiguous.
- It is thus anti-Gricean, but deliberately so.

Conclusion

Four distinct but related motivations for using the injunctive:

■ Anaphoric determination of temporal and modal interpretation:

- ▶ Syntactic and discourse-level contextual specification or specification based on shared common ground (text type, subject matter, etc.).
 - Essentially an elaboration of Kiparsky's (2005) conclusion.

■ Pragmatic contrast:

- ▶ To convey special meanings by means of a contrastive association with more marked verb forms (of the type *prá vocam* 'I proclaim' vs. *prá avocam* 'I have proclaimed').

Conclusion

■ Contextual neutralizations and categorical or lexical restrictions:

- ▶ The aorist is regularly augmentless in past narration, while the present is regularly augmented (=imperfect).
- ▶ Certain words lacking modal forms in part of their paradigm regularly use the injunctive (type *dā́h* 'give!'); and so on.





■ Wordplay:

- ▶ Presumably deliberate vagueness on the part of the Ṛgvedic poet, whereby a single injunctive form ranges over multiple time references. This presupposes and relies on the preceding items in order to operate.







Thank you!




References I

-  Avery, John. 1885. The Unaugmented Verb-Forms of the Rig- and Atharva-Vedas. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 11:326–361.
-  Blutner, Reinhard. 2000. Some aspects of optimality in natural language interpretation. *Journal of Semantics* 17:189–216.
-  Boneh, Nora, and Edit Doron. 2008. Habituality and the Habitual Aspect. In *Theoretical and Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Semantics of Aspect*, edited by Susan Rothstein, 321–348. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
-  ———. 2010. Modal and Temporal Aspects of Habituality. In *Lexical Semantics, Syntax, and Event Structure*, edited by Malka Rappaport Hovav, Edit Doron, and Ivy Sichel, 338–363. New York: Oxford University Press.






References II

-  Cohen, David. 1984. *La Phrase Nominale et l'Évolution du Système Verbal en Sémitique*. Paris: Société Linguistique de Paris.
-  Grønn, Atle. 2007. Horn strategies and optimization in Russian aspect. In *Proceedings of Language, Games, and Evolution*, 1–8. Dublin: ESLLI workshop.
-  ———. 2008. Russian Aspect as Bidirectional Optimization. In *Studies in Formal Slavic Linguistics*, edited by F. Marusic and R. Zaucer, 121–137. *Linguistik International* 19. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
-  Hoffmann, Karl. 1967. *Der Injunktiv im Veda: Eine synchronische Funktionsuntersuchung*. Heidelberg: Winter.

References III

-  Hollenbaugh, Ian. 2021. *Tense and aspect in Indo-European: A usage-based approach to the verbal systems of the Ṛgveda and Homer*. PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles.
<https://ihollenbaugh.files.wordpress.com/2021/06/hollenbaugh-diss.pdf>.
-  Horn, Laurence R. 1984. Towards a new taxonomy of pragmatic inference: Q-based and R-based implicature. In *Meaning, Form, and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications*, edited by Deborah Schiffrin, 11–42. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
-  Jamison, Stephanie W. 2015–. *Rigveda Translation: Commentary*. Accessed 15 May 2021. WordPress.
<http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/>.

References IV

-  Jamison, Stephanie W., and Joel P. Brereton. 2014. *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.
-  Kiparsky, Paul. 1968. Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax. *Foundations of Language* 4 (1): 30–57.
-  ———. 2005. The Vedic Injunctive: Historical and synchronic implications. *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics* 8:219–235.
-  Macdonell, Arthur Anthony. 1916. *A Vedic Grammar for Students*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
-  Renou, Louis. 1952. *Grammaire de la langue védique*. Paris: IAC.

References V



Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1916 [1959]. *Course in General Linguistics*. Edited by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye. Translated by Wade Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library.