

**The syntax of *tád* ‘thereby’ in the Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa**  
Dieter Gunkel (UCLA), dgunkel@humnet.ucla.edu  
ECIEC 44, June 20–22, 2025, LMU München

### 1. Introducing *tád* ‘thereby’

Vedic *tád* ‘thereby’ (AV+) is frequent in prose. It refers anaphorically to the content of the preceding clause(s), e.g.

(1) *bāhūn udgr̥hṇanti | yajamānam eva tat svarge loke samādadhāti*

arms:ACC hold.up:3PL | sacrificer:ACC =FOC thereby heavenly:LOC.SG realm:LOC put.in:3PL

“They hold their arms up. **Thereby**, they put the SACrificer in heaven.” (JB 1.89)

The basic idea: by raising their ARMS (to heaven), they raise the SACrificer to heaven.

- What the two sentences have in common: “they raise *x* to heaven”.
- Narrow focus on *yajamānam* ‘sacrificer’, which contrasts with *bāhūn* ‘arms’.
- *yajamānam* has moved from its neutral preverbal position over the locative complement *svarge loke* “in heaven” and apparently also over *tad* “thereby.”
- *yajamānam* hosts the enclitic particle *eva*, which certainly marks focus, and may also exhaustively identify the referent (so Kobayashi 2014).

Another example, which is typical in that clause with *tad* closes a so-called Vedic syllogism (cf. Verpoorten 1977: 257, Migron 1994). Here, *tad* refers to the content of the two preceding clauses.

(2) *sa yad vācam dadāty — agnir vai vāg — agnim evāsmāi tad dadāti*

he COMP speech:ACC gives — fire:NOM =PTCL speech:NOM — fire:ACC =FOC\_ =him:DAT thereby gives

“In that he gives him speech — speech is fire — he thereby gives him FIRE.” (JB 2.54)

- What the first and third clauses have in common: “he gives him *x*.”
- Narrow focus on *agnim* “fire,” which contrasts with *vācam* “speech.”
- *agnim* is *eva*-marked. *agnim=eva* hosts the enclitic pronoun *asmai* “to him.”

Knowing where *tád* ‘thereby’ sits would help us analyze the syntax of the sentences it inhabits.

### 2. Corpus

Portions of the JB contained in Caland’s (1919) *JB Auswahl*: ca. 35,000 words.

Caland’s (1919) text, translation, and brief notes; Bodewitz’s text, translation, and commentary of JB 1 (1973, 1990). The JB is also relatively wordy compared with other Brāhmaṇa prose.

The corpus yields 133 relatively secure examples of the adverb.

### 3. Syntactic assumptions

I adopt Hale’s analysis of the beginning of the Indo-Iranian and Vedic clause (2018 with refs), which consists of the landing sites for expressions that undergo movement.

EMPHASIS  $C_{wh}$   $cl_{pro}$  TOPIC FOCUS ...

The movement of complementizers, relatives, and interrogatives to the  $C_{wh}$  position(s) happens in neutral word order. So does the movement of enclitic pronouns such as *asmai* in (2).

The movement of expressions into the other three positions (Emphasis, Topic, and Focus) perturbs the neutral word order in order to encode information structure.

In the following, “ME” = an expression that has visibly moved into Emphasis, Topic, or Focus.

#### 4. Distributional facts about *tad* ‘thereby’

How many MEs occur above/left of *tad*, and how many below/right of it?

- Left: 2, 1, or 0.
- Right: 1 or 0.
- Subjects occur both left and right of *tad*.

Adopting Hale’s clause, *tad* must sit between TOPIC and FOCUS.

EMPHASIS  $C_{wh}$   $cl_{pro}$  TOPIC *tad* FOCUS ...

#### 5. Evidence: 2 MEs left of *tad* (9% [12/133])

We predict the expression just left of *tad* to be in Topic. In all 12 examples, it is a pronominal subject supplied by the *sá/tá-* paradigm — good candidates for discourse topics since IIr. (cf. Hale 1991).

In 6/12 examples, the leftmost expression (Emphasis) hosts *vāvā*, which apparently has a similar function to *evā* and points to focus.

Above *tad*: direct object (*paśūn*), subject (*tau*) in the Emphasis and Topic positions, resp.

*etābhyām* “with those (sāmāns)” could have moved into Focus, but we can’t tell.

(3) *paśūn vāva tau tad etābhyām avārundhātām*

cows =FOC? they:DU thereby these:INS.DU obtained:3DU

“They thereby obtained cows with those.” (1.224)

In (4), *satyena* occupies Emphasis and *sa* Topic.

(4) *satyena vai sa tad vācaś śraddhām upahavam avindata*

truth:INS =PTCL he thereby word:GEN trust:ACC invitation:ACC found:3SG

“He thereby found trust (and) invitation through the truth of the word.” (3.24)

#### 6. Evidence: Subjects

Subjects occur to the left of *tad*; they also occur to its right, apparently in their neutral position.

A pronominal subject (*tau*) to the right of *tad*.

Context: the Aśvins have been trying to participate in the Soma ritual. After much ado, the gods finally invite them to serve as Adhvaryu-priests at their ritual.

(5) *tāv adhvaryū āstām | tat tāv apisomāv abhavatām*

they:DU adhvaryus:NOM.DU sat:3DU | thereby they:DU soma-portioned:NOM.DU became:3DU

“They acted as Adhvaryu(-priests); they thereby became soma-portioned.” (3.127)

Subject below both *tad* and a direct object that has moved (*khaṇḍikam audbhāriṃ*) into Focus.

Context: Keśin and Khaṇḍika are competing via sacrifice. A syllogism begins: Keśin sings 24 stotra-verses. The year has 24 half-months.

(6) *saṃvatsarād eva tat khaṇḍikam audbhāriṃ keśi dārbhyo nunude*

year:ABL =FOC thereby Khaṇḍika:ACC Udbhāra.son:ACC Keśin:NOM Darbha.son:NOM shoved:3SG

“Keśin, son of Darbha, thereby pushed Khaṇḍika, son of Udbhāra, out of the year.” (2.124)

Where we find 2 MEs left of *tād*, the data is perfectly compatible with

EMPHASIS ... TOPIC *tād* ...

Pronouns from the *sa/ta-* paradigm would occupy the Topic position.

**7. Evidence: 1 ME left of *tād* (80% [107])**

That expression usually hosts *eva* or *vāva* (92% [98/107]): suggests focus.

The focused, *eva*-marked expression is usually a single noun (68% [67/98]), e.g. *yajamānam*.

(7) *yajamānam eva tat svarge loke samādadhāti*

sacrificer:ACC =FOC thereby heavenly:LOC.SG realm:LOC put.in:3PL

“They hold their arms up. Thereby, they put the SACrificer in heaven.” (JB 1.89)

10/107 also have an ME right of *tād*, as in (8), which is a nicely articulated sentence. See esp. clause (4). The subject (*prajāpatiś cendraś ca*), locative adjuncts (*vasuṣu deveṣu, prātassavane*), and goal PP (*adhy apicitim*) all appear to be in neutral order. Instrumentals have both moved over the subject: *eva*-marked *gāyatrī* is left of *tad* and *chandasā*.

(8) (1) *tad yad gāyatrīṃ prātassavanaṃ saṃpadyate*

(1) CON COMP Gāyatrī:ACC morning.ritual:NOM falls.together.with

(2) 'ṣṭākṣarā gāyatrī (3) aṣṭau vasavo

(2) octosyllabic:NOM Gāyatrī:ACC (3) 8:NOM Vasus:NOM

(4) *gāyatrīaiva tac chandasā prajāpatiś cendraś ca vasuṣu deveṣu prātassavane 'dhy apicitim agacchatām*

(4) Gāyatrī:INS\_ =FOC **thereby** meter:INS Prajāpati:NOM =and Indra:NOM =and Vasus:LOC gods:LOC morning.ritual:LOC into respect:ACC came:3DU

“In that the morning ritual corresponds with the Gāyatrī — the Gāyatrī has eight syllables, the Vasus are eight (in number) — Prajāpati and Indra thereby came into respect amongst the Vasus at the morning ritual through the Gāyatrī as a meter.” (2.101)

It should also be possible for the one moved expression left of *tad* to be in the Topic position.

- 10 examples where the expression left of *tad* is a pronoun from the *sá/tá-* paradigm.
- 9 of those are *eva*-marked (focused, probably in Emphasis), as in (9).

(9) *teṣv eva tad adhy apacitim agacchatām*

them:INS =FOC thereby into respect:ACC came:3DU

“It was among THEM that they thereby came into respect.” (2.101)

That leaves us with one example where the pronoun from the *sa/ta-* paradigm is not *eva*-marked.

*te* refers to a discourse-established group of participants in the ritual, so we might expect it to sit in Topic (rather than Emphasis) on pragmatic grounds, but of course we can’t be sure.

(10) *te vai tad anṛtaṃ kurvanti*

they =PTCL thereby incongruous:ACC.SG do:3PL

ye martyaṃ santam amṛtatvaṃ gamayanti

rel:NOM.PL mortal:ACC.SG being:ACC.SG immortality:ACC go:CAUS.3PL

“They do something incongruous, they who cause him, being mortal, to go to immortality.” (1.89)

## 8. Evidence: 0 MEs left of *tad* (11% [14])

We’ve seen one already. Note that *tad* cannot be enclitic here in clause-initial position.

(11) *tāv adhvaryū āstām | tat tāv apisomāḥ abhavadām*

they:DU adhvaryus:NOM.DU sat:3DU | thereby they:DU soma-portioned:NOM.DU became:3DU

“They acted as Adhvaryu(-priests); they thereby became soma-portioned.” (3.127)

Among the 14, there is none with a visibly moved expression to its right.

There are, however, examples where a non-visible movement seems possible on pragmatic grounds, because the expression to its right is narrowly focused. Here “mutual focus antecedence.”

(12) *tad yan mithunāj jāyate tad asmai lokāya jāyate*

CON REL coupling:ABL is.born:3SG thereby this:DAT world:DAT is.born:3SG

atha yad yajñāj jāyate tad amuṣmai lokāya jāyate

CON REL sacrifice:ABL is.born:3SG thereby that:DAT world:DAT is.born:3SG

“In that he is born from a COUpling, thereby he is born for THIS world. In that he is born from a SACrifice, thereby he is born for THAT world.” (1.259)

- In common: “In that he is born from *x*, thereby he is born for *y* world.”
- In the main clauses, *asmai* and *amuṣmai* are narrowly focused, contrasting with each other. For that reason, they may have moved into the Focus position, but we can’t tell.

For the possibility of such a movement, see (13).

(13) asmin vā ayaṃ loke puṇyaṃ jīvitvā ...

this:LOC =PTCL this:NOM world:LOC virtuously having.lived ...

“This (man), having lived virtuously on THIS world, ...” (1.97)

Summary of NNMEs left of *tad*: When there are two, the first is focused and the second is topical. When there is one, it's usually focused and *eva*-marked. This is consistent with

EMPHASIS ... TOPIC *tád* FOCUS ...

#### 9. Evidence right of *tad*: Overview

- 2 MEs left of *tád* (9% [12]): 0 on the right.
- 1 ME left of *tád* (80% [107]): 10 on the right — 9% in Focus
- 0 MEs left of *tád* (11% [14]): 0 on the right.

I don't think we want to make anything of the two zeros, given how rare visible movement to Focus is in the “1 ME left” data (9%). It could be that visible movement to Focus is rare in general: shorter movement is harder to detect, and we have seen that the Emphasis position hosts focused expressions.

#### 10. Some conclusions

The *tád* under consideration is an anaphoric adverb meaning ‘thereby’. It refers to the propositional content of the preceding clause(s).

Adopting Hale's analysis of the left periphery of the Vedic clause, *tád* ‘thereby’ sits between the Topic and Focus positions.

EMPHASIS  $C_{wh}$   $cl_{pro}$  TOPIC *tád* FOCUS ...

Where there are two expressions above *tad*, they neatly map to the Emphasis and Topic positions. In that data, the Topic position is always implemented by a subject pronoun drawn from the *sá/tá*-paradigm. Contextually, those pronouns qualify as continuing or resumed topics. The expression in Emphasis hosts *vāva* half the time. Comparison with the rest of the data suggests that *vāva* is comparable in function to *eva*. If that is correct, the *vāva*-marked expressions in Emphasis are focused.

Where there is one expression above *tad*, in theory it could be either in Emphasis or Topic. In practice, it usually hosts *eva* or *vāva*, strongly suggesting that it is in Emphasis.

The Emphasis position is frequently implemented in these data.

There may be a sentence where the one expression above *tad* is in Topic.

We also find expressions in the Focus position below *tad*.

*tád* ‘thereby’ cannot be enclitic in the examples where it is clause-initial, and need not be enclitic elsewhere, pace Verpoorten (enclitic *evatad*) and others.

#### 11. A puzzle about the Emphasis position

Whenever the Emphasis position is implemented, with one systematic exception, it is filled by an expression that descriptively consists of a single prosodic word. Furthermore, whenever the context would lead us to expect narrow focus on a constituent that happens to be larger than a word (cf. (4)

above), we nevertheless only find a single word in Emphasis. There may be a restriction on the phonological size of the expression that moves there. There are ca. 10 sentences of that kind.

The context suggests focus on [itaś ca ūrdhvaṃ itaś cāvāñcam], literally “from here to the top and from here to the bottom,” but we only find [itaś ca] in Emphasis. Note that according to at least one analysis (Mitrović 2011), [itaś ca] would be a derived syntactic constituent as well as a phonological word.

(14) itaś ca ha vai sa tad ūrdhvaṃ itaś cāvāñcam pāpmānaṃ apajaghne

hither =and =PTCL =PTCL he thereby top:ACC hither =and bottom:ACC evil:ACC strike.off:3SG

“He struck the calamity off himself upwards and downwards.” (2.84)

The context suggests focus on [yajñena ca stomena ca] “by means of the sacrifice and the stoma,” but only [yajñena ca] is in Emphasis.

(15) yajñena ca vāva te tat stomena cemān lokān samadadhur

sacrifice:INS =and =FOC? they thereby stoma:INS =and these:ACC worlds:ACC put.together:3PL

“They put these worlds together by means of the sacrifice and the stoma.” (1.155)

One possibility is that the entire coordinated phrase moves to Focus, then a smaller part of it moves to Emphasis, perhaps in order to obtain prosodic prominence (cf. Buring 2009). Cf. (16), where *annādyē* “in food” has visibly moved over the temporal adjunct *yajñasyāntataḥ* “at the end of the sacrifice” into the Focus position. The context suggests that [virājy annādyē] is conjoined and focused.

(16) virājy eva tad annādyē yajñasyāntataḥ pratitiṣṭhati

Virāj:LOC =FOC thereby food:LOC sacrifice:GEN\_at.the.end stands.firm:3SG

“He thereby stands firm in the Virāj (and) in food at the end of the sacrifice.” (2.82)

The other examples are like (14) and (15) in the sense that the rest of the multiword constituent that should be focused *could* be in the Focus position or in the neutral position.

The possibility that fronting part of an expression encodes the topicalization or focalization of the entire expression has been on the books for a long time (e.g. Delbrück 1888: 16–17).

The systematic exception I just mentioned involves quotations, which pattern like prosodic words in the data under consideration in two respects: they occupy the Emphasis position and they host *eva*.

There are six examples with the basic form: “When I said *x* to you, what I actually said/meant was *y*.” The entire quotation in the main clause is focused and contrasts with the quotation in the preceding subordinate clause. The main clauses all take the following form. The entire *eva*-marked quotation sits above *tad*, presumably in the Emphasis position.

[quotation]=eva=vas tad avocam

(17) [iḷābhi sma bṛhatīr ārabhadhvam ity] eva vas tad avocam

[Iḍas:ins =ptcl Bṛhatīs:acc take.up:imp.2pl quot] =ptcl =you:dat.pl thereby said:1sg

“I thereby told you, “Begin the Bṛhatī with the Iḍas.” (2.42)

## 12. A higher *tád*

There are other adverbial *táds* with a different meaning and syntax, e.g. *tád* ‘therefore’, which occupies a higher syntactic position than *tád* ‘thereby’.

*tád* ‘therefore’ occurs outside of the scope/domain of *vai*. That is higher than Emphasis and of course even higher than the position occupied by *tad* ‘thereby’.

(18) *tad indro ha vā etad devatānām yat ṛtīyasavanam*

therefore Indra:NOM =PTCL =PTCL that:NOM divinities:GEN COMP third.pressing:NOM

“Therefore, Indra is THAT of the divinities, that is the third pressing.” (1.156)

**13. Copular clauses:** ca. 50 copular clauses with an initial *tád* that should sit higher than *tád* ‘thereby’.

In my view, copular clauses have a neutral order of subject – predicate. Here is a constructed example.

(19) [*etad sāma*] [*avaruddhis*]

[that:NOM sāman:NOM] [obtainment:NOM]

“That sāman is (for) obtainment.”

In many examples (ca. 50), both *etad* and the predicate must have undergone movement, because *etad* is separated from the word it modifies (*sāma*), and the predicate precedes the subject.

(20) *tad etad virājo ’nnādyasyāvaruddhis sāma*

therefore this:NOM Virāj:GEN food:GEN\_obtainment:NOM sāman:NOM

“Therefore, that sāman is for the obtainment of the Virāj (and) of food.” (1.165)

Given this clause structure and two movements, *tad* ‘therefore’ would have to be higher than Topic.

**14. Also some *tads* in *tad yad* ...?** That opens up an attractive possibility, namely that some *tads* in the *tad yad* ... sequences that so frequently introduce subordinate clauses in Vedic prose are *tad* ‘therefore’.

In the preceding context, the sacrificer is identified with Soma; Soma is pressed (into juice); thus the sacrificer is turned into (juice-like) seed; and the Udgātṛ priest is identified with Prajāpati (the procreator and thus seed-emitter *par excellence*). The first *tad* is arguably *tad* ‘therefore’. The second is clearly *tad* ‘thereby’.

(21) *tad yad bahiṣpavamāne retasyām gāyati*

therefore COMP Bahiṣpavamāna:LOC seed.verse:ACC sings

yajamānam eva tad reto bhūtaṃ siñcati

sacrificer:ACC =FOC thereby seed:ACC become:ACC emits

“Therefore, in that he (the Udgātṛ priest) sings the seed-verse at the Bahiṣpavamāna, he thereby emits the *sacrificer*, who has become seed.” (1.259)

*tad* ‘therefore’ occupies the same/a similar position to other clause connectors such as *átha*.

## Works cited

- Bodewitz, Hendrik Wilhelm. 1973. *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I*, 1–65. *Translation and Commentary with a Study Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotra*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bodewitz, H. W. 1990. *The Jyotiṣṭoma Ritual. Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I*, 66–364. *Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Büiring, Daniel. 2009. Towards a typology of focus realization. In *Information Structure: Theoretical, Typological, and Experimental Perspectives*, ed. Malte Zimmermann and Caroline Féry, 177–205. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Büiring, Daniel. 2016. *Intonation and Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Caland, W. 1919. *Das Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl. Text, Übersetzung, Indices*. Amsterdam: Müller.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1878. *Die altindische Wortfolge aus dem Çatapathabrāhmaṇa dargestellt* (*Syntaktische Forschungen von B. Delbrück und E. Windisch* 3). Halle: Waisenhaus.
- Delbrück, Berthold. 1888. *Altindische Syntax* (*Syntaktische Forschungen von B. Delbrück* 5). Halle: Waisenhaus.
- Hale, Mark. 1991. Some observations on intersentential pronominalization in the language of the Taittiriya Saṃhitā. In *Sense and Syntax in Vedic*, ed. Stephanie W. Jamison and Joel P. Brereton, 2–18. Leiden: Brill.
- Hale, Mark. 2018. The syntax of Indo-Iranian. In *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics*, ed. Jared Klein, Brian Joseph, and Matthias Fritz, 1924–1942. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Kobayashi, Masato. 2014. Information structure and the particles vái and evá in Vedic prose. In *Indic across the millennia: From the Rigveda to modern Indo-Aryan*, ed. Jared S. Klein and Kazuhiko Yoshida, 77–92. Bremen: Hempen.
- Migron, Saul. 1994. The Cleft Sentence in Vedic Prose: A Sketch. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 55: 99–122.
- Mitrović, Moreno. 2011. The syntax of coordination in Sanskrit. Master's thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Verpoorten, J.-M. 1977. *L'ordre des mots dans l'Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.